A DEFENCE OF Infant-Baptism,

(In Anſwer to the OBJECTIONS of the late learned Mr. *Gale.*)

In a LETTER

To the Rev. Mr. JOHN WESLEY, A. M. Fellow of *Lincoln* College, *Oxford.*

To which is added,

An APPENDIX,

Chiefly deſigned for the Benefit of the unlearned Reader.

Εμοὶ δὲ εἰς ἐλάχιστόν ἐστιν ἵνα — ἀνακριθῶ — ὑπὸ ἀνθρωπίνης ἡμέρας. 1 Cor iv. 3.

By VIN. PERRONET, A. M.
Vicar of *Shoreham* in *Kent*, and Chaplain to the Right Hon. Earl STANHOPE.

LONDON,
Printed for J. ROBERTS in *Warwick-Lane.*

MDCCXLIX.

[Price Sixpence.]

BRITISH MUSEUM

A DEFENCE OF INFANT BAPTISM.

Shoreham, Kent, Sept. 18. 1749.

My Reverend and Dear Brother,

IN my *Address to the People called Quakers*, published above a Year since, I observe "that the "*Baptism of Infants* had a much better Foun- "dation that Mr. *Barclay* had allowed it; and that "it would be no difficult Matter to make this ap- "pear: But as it was not the *Subject* I was then "upon, I judged proper to wave it for that time." pag. 39. And tho' the Words did not contain any Promise, that I would hereafter treat upon that Point; yet I thought it incumbent on me, to endeavour at least, to make good what I there ventured to affirm; especially as some might expect it from me. The Writer, whose Objections I attempt here to answer, has indeed been dead these many Years. However, tho' there be nothing more unbecoming a *Christian*, than to vilify any Person whatever; especially one, who is no longer able to vindicate himself: Yet the Mistakes and Errors of Men, whether living or dead, may certainly at any time be laid open, provided the

Laws of Truth and Candour be no Way violated. How far I have obſerved this Caution, in the following Remarks, muſt be left to the Judgment of others. And here I would obſerve, that few things have done more hurt to the Religion of *Chriſt*, than where learned Men have contended as earneſtly for mere *Modes* and *Circumſtances*, as if they were of the very *Eſſence* of *Chriſtianity*. For by this Means, Perſons of more *Zeal* than *Knowledge*, have been led to miſtake the *Shadow* for the *Subſtance*; and to imagine that none can have the *Power* of Religion, who have not *their* particular *Form*. I know indeed that the Oppoſers of *Infant-Baptiſm* will not admit, that they are contending for a mere *Mode* or *Circumſtance*: tho' it may be ſubmitted to every unprejudiced Man, whether the Subject of their Diſpute be not as merely *Circumſtantial*, as the Queſtion about *leavened* or *unleavened* Bread; and about Wine *mixt* or *unmixt* with Water, in the other *Sacrament*; and concerning the *Time* and *Poſture* of receiving it?

As to my preſent Deſign, you will eaſily perceive, it is not to condemn either *Adult-Baptiſm*, or *Baptiſm* by *Immerſion*; for our own Church allows of both: but only to vindicate our *own Baptiſm*, from the moſt material Objections that have been brought againſt it: and thus to remove thoſe violent Prejudices, which tend to alienate Men's Hearts from one another, and conſequently from the *Truth as it is in Jeſus*.

I fear the late learned Mr. *Gale* (though, I dare ſay, very undeſignedly) has much contributed towards raiſing ſuch fatal Prejudices; ſince he ventures to affirm, in ſo many Words, that "We "have no Right to *Church-Membership*, nor ought "to be *communicated with*; and that we have *no* "*Baptiſm* amongſt us." P. 81. 84.

It may be left to every wiſe and ſerious Chriſtian to reflect, what unhappy Effects ſuch Notions muſt have

have upon warm and weak Minds! I hope he saw it afterwards himself: and then I doubt not, but he wished that those rash Sentences were out of his Book. May every Professor of *Christianity* be endued with a more *Gospel-Spirit!* If the present Piece should contribute any thing towards this, I shall esteem my Pains well bestowed But now, my dear Friend, as this will be a long Letter, and consist of four distinct Subjects; I shall therefore, for the greater Conveniency of the Reader, divide it into four Parts, or Sections. The first of these will be entirely taken up, with examining into the various Meanings and Acceptations of Words. An Enquiry, which, howsoever unnecessary and dry it may appear, Mr. *Gale* has, notwithstanding, made perfectly necessary.

SECTION I.

THAT Gentleman had undertaken to prove, that βαπτίζω signifies only to dip, [p. 94.] and that *all other Senses are necessarily excluded.* [p. 96.]

In attempting this, some Quotations are made, which pretty plainly contradict what he had at first laid down. However, Mr. *Gale* was to make the most of his own Instances; and therefore he labours with great Ingenuity, to bend them all to his own Hypothesis. This is what we shall more fully speak to hereafter; and, at present, shall observe, that this led him to descant on the Use and Nature of Words and Phrases. Concerning the literal and figurative Meaning of which, that Gentleman employs several Pages: and what would indeed be entirely for his Purpose, he seems inclined to divest Words of *all* Acceptations but *one* only.

And thus [p. 109] he tells his Friend, "I'm inclined to believe, in general, 'tis a Mistake to suppose Words have more than *one* Signification."

This certainly would have been of ſome Service to Mr *Gale*, had the Matter really ſtood thus; but, on the contrary, nothing is more evident, than that one and the ſame Word is often uſed to excite different Ideas in the Mind. And notwithſtanding theſe Ideas may now and then bear ſome Similitude to each other; yet it ſometimes happens, that there is no Reſemblance between 'em. But before we enter upon the Proof of this, I muſt juſt obſerve, that Mr. *Gale*, a few Lines after he has given his own Opinion compliments his Friend, p 110, with being " raiſed above his Remarks, by having read " Mr. *Locke's* Works, and particularly the third " Book of his *Eſſay on human Underſtanding*, con- " cerning the Nature and Uſe of Words and Lan- " guages."

One would really wonder, that Mr. *Gale* ſhould venture expreſly to mention Mr. *Locke's* third Book; ſince nothing can be plainer, than that Mr. *Locke* has there diſcovered very different Sentiments, in relation to the Meaning of Words. In that very third Book, which Mr. *Gale* thought proper to mention, that great Man thus expreſſes himſelf: " Sure I am (ſays he) that the Signification of Words " in all Languages, depending very much on the " Thoughts, Notions, and Ideas of him that uſes " 'em, muſt unavoidably be of great Uncertainty " to Men of the ſame Language and Country. This " is ſo evident in the *Greek* Authors, that he that " ſhall peruſe their Writings, will find in almoſt " every one of them, a diſtinct Language though " the ſame Words." [L. iii. C. 9. §. 22.]

That theſe Obſervations are perfectly juſt, and that Mr. *Gale's* Sentiments of this Matter are without any ſufficient Ground or Reaſon, I come now to make good.

To begin with ὀργή. It is well known that this Word, in its common Acceptation, ſignifies *Wrath*, or *Anger*; and thus it is uſed, as well in the plural as

as singular Number. In the plural, I shall only give one single Instance of it in this Sense.

Isocrates, in his Admonitory Oration to *Demonicus*, acquaints him, in what *Affability* consists: and amongst other Things he tells him, that he must *not* [a] *roughly oppose* [τὰς ὀργὰς] *the Anger of those he is intimate and familiar with; even though they are angry without Cause.*

But *Pindar* uses this Word, in both Numbers, in an Acceptation something different. That Poet assures *Hiero* King of *Sicily*, that [b] *if he would perpetuate his Fame, he must continue to be acted by his nobleness of Mind* [εὐανθεῖ ὀργᾷ] *and not grow tired of Expences.*

Stephens, who, in his Preface to *Pindar*, acquaints *Melanchon*, that he had undertaken a literal Translation, renders it, *generosis moribus: Schmidius* turns it, *generoso in proposito.*

Again in the plural Number. [c] *The Son of Cleonicus* (says the same Poet) *desires to meet Death and hoary old Age, when he is endued* [τοίαισιν ὀργαῖς] *with such Dispositions.* The *Scholiast* explains this by τοιαύτοις τρόποις.

Thucydides seems to use this Word, in both Numbers, to express the particular Frame, Turn, or Temper of the Mind. As where *Pericles*, in an

---

[a] Μηδὲ πρὸς τὰς τῶν πλησιαζόντων ὀργὰς τραχέως ἀπαντᾶν, μηδ' ἂν ἀδίκως ὀργιζόμενοι τυγχάνωσι.

Isocrat. ad Demon. Orat. Admon.

[b] Εὐανθεῖ δ' ἐν ὀργᾷ παρμένων
εἴπέρ τι φιλεῖς ἀκοὰν ἀοιδᾶν ἀ-
εὶ κλύειν, μὴ κάμνε λίαν δαπάναις.

Pyth. Od. 1. *prope finem.*

[c] Τοίαισιν ὀργαῖς εὔχεται
ἀντιάσαις ἀοίδαν γῆ-
ρας τε δέξασθαι πολιὸν
ὁ Κλεονίκου παῖς.

Isth. Od. 6. *non procul a principio.*

Oration to the *Athenians*, acquaints them, that *his Opinion is still the same, not to give way to the Peloponnesians*; [d] *notwithstanding* (says he) *I am very sensible that Men are not governed by the same Sentiments* [τῇ αὐτῇ ὀργῇ] *when actually engaged in War, as they were when at first excited to it; but alter their Minds according to the Event of Things.*

The *Scholiast* makes use of διανοίᾳ, τρόπῳ, σκοπῷ, as synonymous with ὀργῇ. See also *Suidas* [e].

In another Place that Historian, relating the dreadful Condition of the *Corcyreans* during a Sedition, he remarks upon it, that *in Peace and Prosperity both Cities and private Persons are better disposed; but that* [f] *War renders* [τὰς ὀργὰς] *the Temper or Disposition of many, conformable to the present State of Things.*

The *Scholiast*, upon the Place, explains that Expression by τὰς γνώμας; and withal remarks, that *Thucydides* uses ὀργὰς to express γνώμας and τρόπους [g], the *Mind*, *Sentiments*, or *Manners*.

The Verb ἁμαρτάνειν very frequently signifies to commit some *Crime*, *Error*, or *Mistake*; and thus *Plato* uses it in the Dispute between *Socrates* and *Thrasymachus*: as where the latter tells *Socrates*, that *strictly speaking, no Artist is guilty of a Mistake*, [in his Profession] *because* [h] [ὁ ἁμαρτάνων] *he that commits such a Mistake, offends* [ἁμαρτάνει] *through a De-*

---

[d] Καίπερ εἰδὼς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ὑ τῇ αὐτῇ ὀργῇ ἀναπειθομένους τε πολεμεῖν, καὶ ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ πράσσοντας, πρὸς δὲ τὰς ξυμφορὰς καὶ τας γνώμας τρεπομένους.

L. i. p. 45. Edit. Stephan.

[e] Ὀργῇ παρὰ Θεκυδίδῃ, ἀντὶ τῦ διανοίᾳ, τρόπῳ, σκοπῷ.

[f] Ὁ δὲ πόλεμος—πρὸς τὰ παρόντα τὰς ὀργὰς τῶν πολλῶν ὁμοιοῖ. L. iii. p. 110.

[g] Νῦν γὰρ ὀργας τὰς γνώμας καὶ τὺς τρόπους ἐκάλεσεν.

Schol. *in loc. supra citatum.*

[h] Ἐπιλιπόσης γὰρ ἐπιστήμης ὁ ἁμαρτάνων ἁμαρτάνει. ἐν ᾧ οὐκ ἔστι δημιουργός. Plat. de Rep, L. i.

fect

feet of Knowledge; for which Reason he cannot be called an Artist.

But how different a Sense is this, from that in which *Homer* uses it, in that sensibly affecting Speech of *Andromache*, upon the Death of *Hector*? where representing in the most lively Manner, how differently it was like to fare with the young *Astyanax*, from what was his Treatment whilst his Father lived, she breaks out into this very moving Reflection, *but* i *now* [ἀπὸ πατρὸς ἁμαρτῶν] *deprived of his dear Father, the Sufferings of Astyanax are like to be many.*

Nay, *Homer* himself uses this Verb in a Sense well known to those, who are acquainted with the *Greek* Testament; and that is, to *sin* against, or to *offend*, the Deity; but which Acceptation is certainly remote enough from that just mentioned. For Instance; when *Phœnix*, *Ajax*, and *Ulysses* were deputed by *Agamemnon*, and other Commanders of the *Greeks*, to endeavour by fair Promises to intercede with *Achilles*, that he would lay aside his Resentments, and take care of the common Cause of *Greece*; *Phœnix* tells him, *that the* k *Gods themselves, though superior in Virtue, Honour, and Power, were appeased by the Sacrifices and Prayers of their Supplicants, when any had transgressed and offended* [ἁμάρτῃ]. And indeed other *Greek* Writers use this Verb to express what St. *John* expresses by it l.

---

i Νῦν δ' ἂν πολλὰ πάθῃσι φίλῳ ἀπὸ πατρὸς ἁμαρτὼν
Ἀστυάναξ. Iliad X. ℣ 505.

k ——τρεπτοὶ δέ τε καὶ θεοὶ αὐτοί,
τῶν περ καὶ μείζων ἀρετὴ, τιμή τε, βίη τέ,
καὶ μὲν τοὺς θύεσσι καὶ εὐχωλῆς ἀγανῆσι,
λοιβῇ τε, κνίσῃ τε παραπρωπῶσ' ἄνθρωποι
λισσόμενοι, ὅτε κέν τις ὑπερβήῃ καὶ ἁμάρτῃ.
Iliad I. ℣ 493, &c.

l Ch. viii. 11. *Vide* Jacobi Elsner. *Observationes sacras in loc.*

I would

I would observe next, that the common Acceptation of ἀπαγγέλλειν is *renunciare*; sometimes barely *Annunciare*, as 'tis used by [m] St. *Luke*. But in how different a Sense is this Verb found in *Sophocles*? For when *Electra* could not persuade her Sister *Chrysothemis* to lend her Assistance in revenging the Death of their Father, on the Adulterer *Ægisthus*; and *Chrysothemis* had, on the contrary, endeavoured to dissuade *Electra* from her Purpose, *Electra* answers in a Rage,—[n] *Your Discourse has not surprized me; I knew full well, you would reject* [ἃ 'πηγγελλόμην] *what I advised or requested.*

Ἀπηγγελλόμην [says the Scholiast] ἀντὶ τοῦ ἃ ἠξίουν. τὸ δὲ παρακαλεῖν, ἀπαγγέλλειν φησιν.

Nor does *Euripides* use the Verb πράττειν in a Sense less foreign to its general and ordinary Acceptation. As where *Tyndarus* is introduced expostulating with *Menelaus* for conversing with *Orestes*, after he had murdered his Mother.

[o] *My Daughter* (says the old King) *in being murdered, has suffered justly* [ἔπραξεν ἔνδικα] *but it was by no Means fitting, that she should die by his Hands.*

Again, when *Electra* had directed her Brother, and *Pylades* to seize *Hermione*, she adds, [p] *That Menelaus may perceive, that having met with Men, and not with dastardly Phrygians, he has suffered* [ἔπραξεν] *what evil Men ought to suffer* [πράσσειν.]

---

[m] Cap. viii. 20.

[n] Ἄρ' σδόκητον ἡδὺν εἴρηκας καλῶς;
δ' ἤδειν σ' ἀπορρίψουσαν ἃ 'πηγγελλόμην.
Soph. Elect. ℣ 1020, 1021.

[o] Θυγάτηρ ἐμὴ θανοῦσ', ἔπραξεν ἔνδικα·
Ἀλλ' οὐχὶ πρὸς τοῦδ' εἰκὸς ἦν αὐτὴν θανεῖν.
Euripid. Orest. ℣ 537, 538.

[p] ὡς εἰδῇ τόδε,
Μενέλαος, οὔτι ἄνδρας, ἢ φρύγας κακοὺς,
Εὑρὼν, ἔπραξεν οἷα χρὴ πράσσειν κακούς.
Ibid. ℣ 1354, &c.

The

The Verb ἀξιοῦν, in its primary Acceptation signifies to think or esteem a Person worthy: as, where *Plato* introduces the forward *Thrasymachus*, enquiring of *Socrates*, *What he thought himself worthy to suffer or undergo* [τί ἀξιοῖς παθεῖν] *in case another and better Definition of Justice should be given, than had already been given by him and* Polemarchus; —to which the Philosopher answers [ἀξιῶ παθεῖν] [q] *I esteem myself worthy to undergoe, what an ignorant Person ought to do; and that is, to be instructed by those that are wise.*

However, *Plato* himself, *Xenophon*, and *Isocrates* use the same Verb for *to ask* or *desire*. As for instance, *Socrates* is represented in his Apology, repeating the Accusation exhibited against him; and appealing to many of his Judges for the Falseness of it: and withal remarking, that since there were several, who had been present at his Disputations, [r] *He desires them* [ἀξιῶ ὑμᾶς] *to inform one another, whether they ever heard him disputing about any thing, like what he was accused of.*

In the same Sense is this Word used by *Xenophon*. For after he has mentioned the Interview between *Cyaxares* and *Cyrus*, and the Preparations made for entertaining the former; *Xenophon* represents him [f] *asking Cyrus* [ἠξίου τὸν Κῦρον] *to eat with him.*

And thus also does *Isocrates* use the same Verb in his Oration to *Nicocles*. Where, amongst other excellent Counsel he gives him, in relation to Go-

---

q Τί ἀλλὸ ἢ ὅπερ προσήκει πάσχειν τῷ μὴ εἰδότι; προσήκει δέ που μαθεῖν παρὰ τοῦ εἰδότος· καὶ ἐγὼ οὖν τοῦτο ἀξιῶ παθεῖν. Plat. de Repub. L. i.

r Ἀξιῶ ὑμᾶς ἀλλήλους διδάσκειν τε καὶ φράζειν, &c.
Socrat. Apol. *non procul à princip.*

f Καλέσας ὁ Κυαξάρης ἠξίου τὸν Κῦρον, διὰ χρόνου ἡδονὴν ἀυλὸν, συνδειπνεῖν.
Cyropæd. L. v. *prope finem.*

vernment,

vernment, he advises that *Strangers may find a safe Retreat in his City*; [t] *and that of all Strangers, he would esteem those the most, not who brought him Gifts; but such as desired to receive* [*some Favour*] *from him* [λαμβάνειν ἀξιοῦντας.]

A Person, who is in any Measure conversant in the *Greek Testament*, must be thoroughly sensible, that δόξα and δοξάζω are there frequently used; and that the former constantly signifies *Glory*, *Honour*, *Praise*, or the like: and the latter, to give or ascribe *Glory*, *Honour*, &c. to another.—But in how different a Sense these Words are used by other Authors, must be very evident to any, who are acquainted with their Writings.

To confirm this by some Instances.

And first, though [v] *Pindar* and [w] *Isocrates* sometimes use δόξα in the same Acceptation, in which the Writers of the *New Testament* use it; yet both of them also make use of it in a Sense altogether unknown to those Writers.—As ἐμὰν δόξαν in [x] *Pindar*, signifies — *according to my Opinion.*

And in *Isocrates* it is put for common *Rumour* or *Opinion*; and stands opposed to what is *true*. And this, even within four Lines of the Place, where he had used the same Word in the Acceptation abovementioned. For after he has advised *Demonicus to pursue those Pleasures which are honourable* [τὰς ἡδονὰς τὰς μετὰ δόξης] he proceeds to admonish him, that he would *carefully guard against Accusations, notwithstanding they were false.* [y] *Because the Vul-*

---

[t] Περὶ πλείστου δὲ ποιοῦ τῶν ἀφικνουμένων μὴ τοὺς σοὶ δωρεὰς εἰσαγομένας, ἀλλὰ τοὺς παρὰ σοῦ λαμβάνειν ἀξιοῦντας. Isocrat. ad Nicoclem. Orat de Regno. *circa medium.*

[v] Isth. Ode 3. Ode 6. et alibi.

[w] Isocrat. Orat. Admon. ad Demonicum.

[x] Nem. Ode 11.

[y] Οἱ γὰρ πολλοὶ τὴν μὲν ἀλήθειαν ἀγνοοῦσι, πρὸς δὲ τὴν δόξαν ἀποβλέπουσι. Isocrat. Orat. Adm. ad Demon.

gar,

gar, says he, *are ignorant of the Truth; but regard* [τὴν δόξαν] *common Fame or Opinion. Aristotle* uses δόξα for *Opinion*, and δοξάζειν for to *think*.

[z] *Opinion* [ἡ δόξα] says the Philosopher, *appears to be conversant about every thing; as well about those Things which are eternal and impossible, as about those, that are in our own Power.*

Some, says the same Philosopher, *seem* [δοξάζειν] *to think right; but through some Depravity, chuse what they ought not* [a]. *Plato* often uses δόξα in the Sense last-mentioned. To consider only one Place.— *Adimantus*, one of *Plato's* Dialogists, in his Tracts *De Republicâ*, addressing himself to *Socrates*, tells him, that *all the Poets, with one Mouth, declare Temperance and Justice to be good and honourable; though at the same Time, difficult and laborious* [b]: *and that Intemperance and Injustice are pleasant and easy to be acquired; but base and filthy* [δόξῃ] *in Opinion and Law.*

The same Philosopher uses δοξάζεσθαι in the same Acceptation, in which he had used δοκεῖν a few Pages before.

As where *Adimantus*, resuming the Discourse of *Glauco*, tells *Socrates*, that *Musæus* and his Son [c] *mention the same Punishments concerning the Unjust, as* Glauco *had recounted of those who were really*

---

[z] Ἡ μὲν γὰρ δόξα δοκεῖ περὶ πάντα εἶναι, καὶ οὐδὲν ἧττον περὶ τὰ ἀΐδια καὶ τὰ ἀδύνατα, ἢ τὰ ἐφ' ἡμῖν.

Ethic. Nicom. L. iii. C. 2.

[a] Ἔνιοι δοξάζειν [δοκοῦσι] μὲν ἄμεινον, διὰ κακίαν δ' αἱρεῖσθαι οὐχ ἃ δεῖ. Arist Ethic. Nicom. L. iii. C. 2.

[b] —— ἀκολασία δὲ καὶ ἀδικία, ἡδὺ μὲν, καὶ εὐπετῆς κτήσασθαι, δόξῃ δὲ μόνον καὶ νόμῳ αἰσχρόν.

Plat. de Repub. L. ii.

[c] Ἅπερ Γλαύκων περὶ τῶν δικαίων, δοξαζομένων δὲ ἀδίκων, διῆλθε τιμωρήματα, ταῦτα περὶ τῶν ἀδίκων λέγουσιν.

Plat. de Rep. L. ii.

just [δοξαζομένων δὲ ἀδίκων] *but seemed or appeared to be unjust.*

How *Sophocles* and *Euripides* use this Verb, may be seen by the following Instances.

When the pretended Mariner, in the *Philoctetes* of *Sophocles*, was sent with a feigned Story from *Ulysses*, in order to decoy *Philoctetes* from *Lemnos*; he tells *Neoptolemus* (whom *Ulysses* had entrusted with managing this Affair) — [d] *Since I have light on you, not in the least thinking* [δοξάζων μὲν οὔ] *or expecting* [to find you here] *but coming accidently to this Shore.*

We shall now just observe how δόξα is used by the same Author, and then proceed to *Euripides*.— When *Philoctetes* is informed by *Hercules*, that he and *Neoptolemus* must go together to *Troy*, he bids farewel to *Lemnos*; — [e] *Now we leave you* (says *Philoctetes*) *though we never expected, or looked for, it* [δόξης οὔ πολε τῆς δ' ἐπιβάντες.] Or, to translate it more literally,— *though we never entertained* [τῆς δόξης] *any Opinion, Thought, or Expectation* [that this would happen.]

Euripides uses δοξάζειν for *to think* or *imagine*. As where *Electra* having desired her Brother *Orestes* to keep close to his Bed, she tells him, that [f] *notwithstanding he be not out of Order; yet if he do but imagine or apprehend himself to be so* [δοξάζῃς νοσεῖν] *it is a great Evil and Misfortune.*

Surely, whoever can reconcile these Acceptations, with the Sense these Words constantly bear in the

---

d Ἐπεὶ περ ἀνέκυρσα, δοξάζων μὲν οὔ,
Τύχῃ δέ πως πρὸς ταυτὸν ὁρμισθεὶς πέδον.
Soph. Philoct. ℣ 546, 547.

e Λείπομεν ὑμᾶς, λείπομεν ἤδη,
Δόξης οὔπολε τῆς δ' ἐπιβάντες.
Soph. Philoct. *in fine.*

f Κἂν μὴ νοσῇς γάρ, ἀλλὰ δοξάζῃς νοσεῖν,
Κάμαλος βροτοῖσιν ἀπορία τε γίνεται.
Euripid. Orest. ℣ 314, 315.

New

New Testament, is capable of reconciling any thing whatever!—But to proceed.

It is certain, that the Verb κινδυνεύειν, in its common and general Acceptation, answers to the *Latin* Verb *Periclitari*, *to be in Danger*; but yet this Verb does *Plato* often use, in a Sense as foreign to it, as any thing can well be conceived to be: and that is, he frequently uses it in the same Signification with δοκεῖν, *to seem* or *appear*.

To give only two or three Instances of it. *Socrates*, in his Apology, acquaints his Judges, that *his having the Name of a wise Man, must be owing to some sort, or degree, of Wisdom*; but then he modestly gives them to understand, that he *had no claim to any Wisdom, which exceeded what was human: for*, says *Socrates* [g], *it is indeed owing to this, that I seem* [κινδυνεύω] *to be wise*.

Immediately after this Declaration, he goes on to inform them, what was the Method he took, in order to find out, what the true Meaning of the Oracle could be. And next proceeds to make this Observation,—[h] *Oh ye Athenians*, says the Philosopher, *it appears* [κινδυνεύει] *that God* [alone] *in truth is wise*.

To mention only one Place more relating to this Verb. In the Dialogue concerning the Being of a God, Divine Providence, &c. the *Athenian Hospes* is represented thus discoursing with *Clinias*;—[i] *Friend*, says he, *all in a manner seem* [κινδυνεύουσι] *to be ignorant, what the Nature and Faculties of the Soul are*.

---

g Τῷ ὄντι γὰρ κινδυνεύω ταύτην [σοφίαν] εἶναι σοφός.
Apolog. Socrat. *non procul à principio*.

h Τὸ δὲ κινδυνεύει, ὦ Ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, τῷ ὄντι ὁ θεὸς σοφὸς εἶναι. Idem. Ibid.

i Ψυχὴν, ὦ ἑταῖρε, ἠγνοηκέναι κινδυνεύουσι μὲν ὀλίγου ξύμπαντες οἷόν τε ὂν τυγχάνει καὶ δύναμιν ἣν ἔχει. De Leg. L. x. Vid. etiam Platonis Criton. Phædon, et Alcibiadem 2dum.

Again; how differently is the Verb δικαιῶσθαι used by *Thucydides* and *Aristotle?*

In the former it signifies *to condemn*, as where *Cleon* tells the *Athenians* that, by altering their Resolution in regard of the *Mitylenians*, [k] *they would rather* [δικαιώσεσθε] *condemn themselves.*

In the latter, it signifies a Man's *obtaining his Right, or having Justice done him.* As where the Philosopher observes, [l] *That it is impossible to receive an Injury, unless there be some to do that Injury; or for a Man* [δικαιῶσθαι] *to obtain his Right, or have Justice done him; unless there be some Person to do him that Right or Justice.*

But now, if it should be thought, that there may be little or no Difference here in the Signification of this Word; because *condemning* may be said in many Cases, to be only doing what is *right* and *just* either to the Person condemned, or some other;—we need only attend to the Occasion of those Words in *Thucydides*, in order to discern that they can possibly bear no such Construction; but that they are used in a Sense as distinct from the Philosopher's, as can well be imagined.

This Oration then of *Cleon*, was designed to confirm the *Athenians* in their cruel and sudden Decree, of putting the *Mitylenians* to Death.

The Day after they had resolved upon this, they repented of it; and brought the Matter again into debate. But this Orator, who was one of the most violent of the Citizens, and who had excited them to their first Resolution, endeavours in this Harangue to keep them steady to their former Purpose.—*If,*

---

k Ὑμᾶς δὲ αὐτὸς μᾶλλον δικαιώσεσθε.
Thucyd. L. iii. p. 96. Edit. H. Steph.

l Ἀδύνατον γὰρ ἀδικεῖσθαι, μὴ ἀδικοῦντος· ἢ δικαιοῦσθαι, μὴ δικαιοπραγοῦντος. Ethic. ad Nicom. L. v. C. 9.

says

ſays he, [m] *you are perſuaded by me, you will do that which is juſt in regard of the* Mitylenians; *and what is uſeful at the ſame Time. But if you determine otherwiſe, you will not oblige theſe* [ungrateful] *Men; but rather condemn yourſelves. For if they have done right to make a Revolt, your Dominion over them cannot be juſt.*

So that the Meaning of *Cleon* is plainly this, "That for the *Athenians* to reverſe their Sentence, "would be to acknowledge the Injuſtice of their "Dominion; and conſequently a condemning "themſelves, for having paſt an unjuſt Decree."

To the ſame Effect is the Obſervation of the *Greek* Shcoliaſt upon this Paſſage, — [n] *You will prove againſt yourſelves that your Authority is uſurped and illegal.*

But now, though a Reaſon may often be aſſigned for theſe various Acceptations; yet, if one and the ſame Word be made uſe of to expreſs different Conceptions of the Mind, it is not our being able, or not able, to account for this, that can poſſibly make the leaſt Alteration in the Thing itſelf.

And therefore to finiſh this Section, I hope I may ſafely venture to affirm, that it has been clearly made out, beyond any reaſonable Contradiction (for there is no End of cavilling) that the Acceptations of many Words, amongſt the beſt of Writers, have been ſometimes widely different [o]: and that Mr.

---

[m] Πειθόμενοι μὲν ἐμοὶ, τά τε δίκαια ἐς Μιτυληναίους καὶ τὰ ξύμφορα ἅμα ποιήσετε· ἄλλως δὲ γνόντες, τοῖς μὲν οὐ χαριεῖσθε, ὑμᾶς δὲ αὐτοὺς μᾶλλον δικαιώσετε. εἰ γὰρ οὗτοι ὀρθῶς ἀπέστησαν, ὑμεῖς ἀν ὐ χρεὼν ἄρχοιτε.

Loco ſupra citato.

[n] Δικαίως καθ' ὑμῶν ἀποδείξετε ὅτι τυραννικῶς ἄρχετε.

Vid. Scholiaſt. *in locum.*

[o] See what the learned *Le Clerc* obſerves to this Purpoſe, in his *Ars Critica*, p. 2. Sect. 1. Cap. 10. See alſo the Miſcellaneous Notes of the very learned Dr. *Pocock* on the *Porta Moſis of Maimonides*, p. 9, 20.

Gale's Suggestions to the contrary, are altogether and entirely without Foundation.

SECTION II.

HAVING in the former very fully made out, that Mr. *Gale* was entirely mistaken in relation to what he advances about the Sense and Meaning of Words, in the general; I design in this, principally to consider what he lays down, in Relation to βαπτίζω, in particular.

At p. 94, that Gentleman enters into the Merits of the Dispute about *Baptism*; and therefore first begins with settling the true Notion of βάπτω, or βαπτίζω: for it must be remembred, that he argues from both these Verbs indifferently; and insists upon it, that they are perfectly synonymous[p].— It is not, in my Opinion, here material to enter into a Debate about this Matter: and therefore, though Mr. *Gale* be certainly mistaken in this respect; yet allowing what he affirms, we shall proceed upon this Supposition, to remark upon what he lays down at the Page just mentioned.

"I cannot see (says that Gentleman) but the Word "*Baptize* necessarily includes dipping in its Signi-"fication; and that *Christ*, by commanding to "*baptize*, has commanded to *dip* only.

"Mr. *Wall*[q] indeed tells me this is plainly a Mi-"stake; but I have no great Opinion of his Judg-"ment, and won't take his Word: on the con-"trary, I hope to make it appear plainly to be an "unavoidable Truth, and no mistake."

---

[p] P. 93. and 217.

[q] This learned and reverend Person, wrote the History of *Infant Baptism*; and likewise a large Answer to Mr. *Gale's* Objections.

A lit-

A little after, he thus proceeds, " I have carefully observed it a considerable Time, as it occurred in Reading, and assure you, I never found it once used to signify to pour or sprinkle, or any thing less than dipping; and I may challenge any Man to shew a single Instance of it, except in some ecclesiastical Writers of the latter corrupt Times."

All this is indeed very positively said; but how far Mr. *Gale* makes good what he here advances, we shall presently see by some of those very Instances, which he produces himself.

At p. 104, Mr. *Gale* quotes a Passage out of *Aristophanes* [r] concerning *Magnes*, an old Comick of *Athens*; " Who used the Lydian Musick, shaved the Face, and smeared it over [βαπτόμενος] with tawny Washes." After he has mentioned this, he observes upon it, that " *Aristophanes* here speaks of the homely Entertainments of the antient Theatre, where the Actors daubed themselves with Lees of Wine, and any odd Colours. This the Poet expresses by βαπτόμενος βατραχείοις, not that he supposes (says Mr. *Gale*) they dipped their Faces into the Colour, but rather smeared the Colour on their Faces."

Soon after this [P. 105.] he quotes a Passage from *Aristotle* [s], where the Philosopher, speaking of that part of the *Polypus*, which is called μήκων, observes, that *if it be pressed, it dyes* [βάπτει] *and colours the Hand.*

Mr. *Gale* frankly owns [P. 104.] that *dipping* cannot be meant in these Passages; and indeed the Mat-

---

[r] Ἱππεῖς, Act I. Scen. III.

Καὶ λυδίζων, καὶ ψηνίζων, καὶ
Βαπτόμενος βατραχείοις.

[s] Hist. Animal. L. v. Cap. 15.

Θλιβόμενος δὲ, βάπτει καὶ ἀνθίζει τὴν χεῖρα.

ter

ter is so self-evident, that it speaks for itself. However it was but ten Pages before [P. 94.] that he expresly declares, "He *never* found that Word *once* "used to signify *any thing less* than *dipping*; and "challenges any Man to shew a *single* Instance of "it, except in some *ecclesiastical Writers* of the latter corrupt Times."

Can a Person attend to all this, without being in a little Suspence, how Mr. *Gale* will reconcile these Things? Or would not any one, who had never before heard of *Aristophanes* or *Aristotle*, be inclined to think that they were both *ecclesiastical Writers of the latter corrupt Times?*

Nor is the Matter at all mended, by insisting [P. 105.] that "in these Passages, the Word is improperly and metaphorically used: that there is a "manifest Allusion to the Art of Dying; and that "the Word is borrowed from thence."

That Mr. *Gale* has quoted some Places, where the Word is used figuratively, is very certain:—as *a Bird* [βαπτὸς ὄρνις] *dyed or coloured by Nature*, out of *Aristophanes*: and where *Plutarch* says, that *that which is black of itself* [τὸ αὐτόχρωμον μέλαν] *is dyed or coloured by Nature* [φύσει βαπτόν ἐστι]. But then how does it appear, that the Passages before-mentioned, are of the same Kind; though Mr. *Gale* saw proper to join them together?

To say that any thing is *stained* or *coloured* by Nature, is plainly a *figurative* Expression. But to say a Man's Face or Hand is *stained* or *coloured*, which has been smeared over, either with *Vermilion*, or the Juice of *green Walnuts*,—is only to say, what is *strictly* and *literally* True.

And therefore the most that Mr. *Gale* could, with any Shadow of Reason, have affirmed, in Relation to the *Face of Magnes*, or the *Hand* in *Aristotle*, would have been only to object, that the Word was not there used in its *strict* and *primary* Signification. But then to have objected this, which is

 all,

that, with any Reason, could have been done, would by no Means have solved the Difficulty: unless it could at the same Time be made appear, that nothing must pass for the *Meaning* of a Word, but its *one primary* Acceptation *only*. Whereas, if Words are really used in different Senses, by Authors of equal Credit (and which I presume has, in the former Section, been abundantly made out) ought not each of these Acceptations to be esteemed a *just* and *true* Sense of the Word?

And, therefore, notwithstanding βάπτω or βαπτίζω should primarily include *dipping* in their Signification; yet if Writers of unquestionable Authority use these Words to express that, which has evidently *nothing* to do with *dipping*; are not these Acceptations as much the Meaning of the Word, as those which really include it? And is it not directly begging the Question, when a Man is pressed with these Difficulties, to talk of "a manifest[t] Allusion in all such Passages to the Art of Dying; "that the Word is borrowed from thence; and "that its true primitive Meaning only is still referred to and implied?" Besides, it is very surprizing that *that Meaning only should be referred to and implied*; which Mr. *Gale* had just acknowledged could not there be meant.

For he ushers in the Passages just mentioned, in the following Manner:—"Where[v] (says Mr. *Gale*) "though indeed the Word is used, it appears by "other Circumstances, that the Writer could not "mean *dip* by it."—However, notwithstanding *the Writer could not mean it*; Mr. *Gale* is resolved to do it himself: and *that true primitive Meaning*, which neither *Aristophanes* nor *Aristotle* could so much as mean, must be *that*, and *that only*, *which is still referred to and implied!*

---

[t] P. 105. [v] P. 104.

Besides,

Besides, that Gentleman had declared [P. 96.] "That he did not remember one Passage, where all "other Senses are not *necessarily excluded* besides "*dipping*."—And yet here are two Passages produced by himself, *Where*, he affirms, *the Writer could not mean dipping!* So that if we will but allow that *Poet* and that *Philosopher* to have understood *Greek*, and to have had any *Meaning* at all; it is then evident to a Demonstration, that "all other "Senses are not necessarily excluded besides." And, therefore, the raising a Cloud about *Allusions* and *Metaphors*, looks extreamly like serving an *Hypothesis*: and this possibly we shall see more of, before you are freed from the Trouble of the present Section.

At P. 96. after Mr. *Gale* has made a Quotation out of *Homer's* Odysses, where βάπτω evidently signifies *dipping*; he proceeds to quote a Passage out of that famous burlesque Poem, which is given to that Author.—The Verse stands thus translated in Mr. *Gale's* Book,—[w] *He breathless fell, and the Lake was tinged with Blood.* But this Gentleman considering, that Blood barely *poured* or *sprinkled* into Water, would go near to tinge or tincture it; he thought the Verb ἐβάπτετο ought not to be left in such a loose Translation: and therefore he tells us [P. 97.] that "the Expression is an Hyperbole; and that "the literal Sense is, the Lake was dipped in "Blood." And he is of Opinion, that ὥσπερ ὥσαν, &c. *are to be understood to qualify the seeming Extravagance of the Expression:* and withal observes, that if we *supply some Particle*, which he fancies *the Poet may suppress, the Sense* (says Mr. *Gale*) *will run very clear thus,—the Lake was as if it had been dipped in Blood.*

---

[w] ψ 218. Batrachom.

Κάππεσε, δ' ἐκ ἀνέπνευσεν, ἐβάπτετο δ' αἵματι λίμνη.

But

But still there appears to be an Uneasiness in this learned Writer, as if this would injure what he had undertaken to prove; and therefore he comes to this final Determination of the Matter, [P. 98] that "*the Sense of βάπτω, even in this Place, is to dip,* "*and nothing else.*"

What miserable Torturing is here of a poor Word! First *the Lake is tinged:* but because this does not *necessarily include Dipping in its Signification,* and so does not come up to the Standard Mr. *Gale* had laid down; *tinged* is instantly laid aside; and the literal Sense, is, *the Lake is dipped.* In the next Place it is, *as if it were* dipped; and last of all *its dipped* again!

But now after all this; after Mr. *Gale* has endeavoured to solve every Difficulty, by *metaphorical* and *elliptical Phrases*; and affirming, that *the Phrase is borrowed from the Dyers, and that the Poet plainly alludes to* their Art; [P. 96] could any one expect, in that very same Letter, to meet with what follows?

"The Word βαπτίζω (says Mr. *Gale*) perhaps "does not *so necessarily* express the Action of *putting* "*under* Water, as in general a Thing's being in "that Condition, no matter *how* it comes so, whe-"ther it is *put into* the Water, or the Water *comes* "*over* it, though indeed to put it into the Water "is the most natural Way, and the most common, "and is therefore usually and pretty constantly, but "it may be, *not necessarily* implied." P. 117.

Let us only take a View of these following Propositions, which are all to be met with in Mr. *Gale's* third Letter.

"P. 94. βαπτίζω *ne-*"*cessarily* includes *dip-*"*ping* in its Signification. "This is an *unavoidable* "*Truth.* I never found "it *once* used to signify

"P. 117. βαπτίζω per-"haps does *not so necessa-*"*rily* express the Action "of *putting under* Water, "as in general a Thing's "being in that Condi-

any

"*any Thing less* than "*dipping*.

"P. 96. I do not remember *one* Passage, "where *all* other Senses "are not *necessarily* ex-"*cluded* besides *dipping*.

"P. 106. I insist upon it, that the Word "literally signifies *only* "to dip."

"tion, no matter *how* "it comes so;—[And] "it may be [the putting "it into the Water] is "*not necessarily* implied."

All which amounts to thus much, βαπτίζω does, and does not, *necessarily include Dipping, in its Signification!*——How many Inconveniences might Men of Letters often avoid in Controversy; if they were but indifferent on which Side of the Question *Truth* lay?

It may indeed be matter of Surprize, what could be the Reason, that should induce Mr. *Gale* to make such a Concession, as entirely overthrows all he had been labouring and contending for! The Reason seems evidently this——That Gentleman had cited a Passage [P. 116] from [x] *Aristotle de Mirabil. auscult.* where that Philosopher is speaking of a certain *Land uninhabited*, "*whose Coast is not laid* "*under Water* [βαπτίζεσθαι] *at Ebb; but when the* "*Tide comes in, 'tis wholly covered and overwhelmed.*"

This Passage was the Occasion of Mr. *Gale's* granting what we have just observed: and indeed whoever attends to it, in any measure, will readily perceive, that he did not break in upon his own *Hypothesis*, without the last Necessity.——For it was impossible, on the one hand, to suppose, that in a bare and plain Narration, where there was not the least room for *Hyperbole*, or any Straining whatever; that *Aristotle* should be so barren of Lan-

x Ὅταν μὲν ἄμπωτις ᾖ, μὴ βαπτίζεσθαι [τόπους] ὅταν δὲ πλημμύρα καὶ κατακλύζεσθαι.

guage,

guage, as to use a Word which could not convey his Meaning in a clear and natural manner. Nor on the other hand could it be imagined, that the great Philosopher's Fancy was so much heated, and so wonderfully upon the Wing, as to think of exciting any Image in the Mind of his Readers, which was not strictly and literally true.——But however, thus much is certain, Mr. *Gale* has made that frank and publick Acknowledgment which has been just recited.——It is indeed easy to be discerned, that he is very unwilling to grant any thing inconsistent with the Scheme he has laid down. And therefore when he is obliged, of mere Necessity, to do this; he really does it with as much Ingenuity as the Nature of the Thing is capable of. A very full and clear Instance of this appears in the Quotation we last mentioned: and therefore I beg leave to speak a little more distinctly to the several Observations, he makes upon that Passage.——We shall begin with his Introduction to it.

"There is [says that Gentleman, p. 116] an-
"other Place in this Author, and I remember no
"other in all his Works, which may seem to have
"some Difficulty in it, and therefore I will be so
"fair as to mention it."

After which he proceeds to the Quotation itself; and then remarks upon it, in the following Manner.

"βαπτίζεσθαι being used here to signify the Land
"was under Water, by the Water's coming in upon
"it, and not by its being put into the Water, some
"perhaps may think it a considerable Objection:
"but it will be found of no Advantage to our Ad-
"versaries, if it be observed, that it here necessarily
"and unavoidably imports to be under Water, or
"to be overwhelmed or covered with Water, which
"no way suits our *English* Pedobaptists, but is very
"agreeable with what the Antipedobaptists, and
"the whole *Greek* Church (which, one would ima-
"gine, should understand the Force of the Word) at
"this Day continue to practise: and this being the

" plain Sense of this Place, 'tis natural enough to " say, *as it were*, or *in a manner*, or some such " Expression is to be understood." P. 116, 117.

I was willing to transcribe the whole Paragraph, for fear separating of it should pervert that Gentleman's Meaning; though I really think there will appear more of Art than of Solidity in it.

First then, he says, *the Verb signifies, in this Place, the Land was under Water, by the Water's coming in upon it, and not by its being put into the Water.*

Secondly, *That it here necessarily and unavoidably imports, to be under Water, or to be overwhelmed or covered with Water.*

And thirdly, that *this is very agreeable with the Practice of the Antipedobaptists and Greek Church.* That is, if I rightly understand the Meaning of these Words; There is a great Agreement between a Subject having Water *poured* over it; and a Subject being *immersed* or *dipt*. Consequently the Disagreement between Baptism by *Affusion*, and Baptism by *Immersion*, cannot be very great. Mr. *Gale* adds,— " *And this being the plain Sense of this Place, 'tis na-* " *tural enough to say*, as it were, *or*, in a manner; " *or some such Expression is to be understood.*"

I think there would be no Difficulty in understanding this last Sentence, were it not for those qualifying Words, *as it were*, or, *in a manner*; but these entirely darken the whole Matter again.—— For certainly, first of all, it is natural enough to suppose, when Mr. *Gale* says, " *This being the plain* " *Sense of this Place*," that he refers to what, he affirms, *is here the Meaning of* βαπτίζεσθαι; or where else are we to look for *the plain Sense of it?* But he owns in so many Words, that this Verb *is here used to signify the Land was under Water, by the Water's coming in upon it.* And therefore when the Land is thus actually under Water, where is the Necessity of saying,—The Land is, *as it were*, under Water?

But now, notwithstanding all this softening of the Word, that Gentleman proceeds [at p. 117] to

 acknow-

acknowledge (as we have already remarked) " that " the Verb βαπτίζω does not perhaps *so necessarily* " express the Action of putting under Water, as in " general a Thing, being in that Condition; whe- " ther it is put into the Water, or the Water comes " over it."

But then, at the very Heels of this, as if he had granted too much, and would willingly recall it again; he desires his Friend,—" In case he believed " there was any Difficulty remaining, to consider " [the Passage] impartially; and to examine it by " the Rules he had laid down for understanding " metaphorical and elliptical Forms of Speech."

Would any one expect this to follow, who considers what Mr. *Gale* had immediately before said? Or is it possible to conceive, what Need there is for *examining* a Word *by Rules fitted for metaphorical and elliptical Forms of Speech*; when, if Mr. *Gale* would have stood by his own Determination about the Meaning of that Verb, the Sense of the Quotation is perfectly clear and easy? nor is there the least Reason for calling in the Aid of any *Metaphor or Ellipsis* to soften or support it.

And therefore after Mr. *Gale* had expressly allowed, that the Verb in dispute does as well signify a Thing under Water, by the Water's *coming* over it, as by its being *plunged* into that [p. 117]—— I say, after this, even within the Compass of a few Lines, to recommend the having Recourse to *Rules, for understanding metaphorical and elliptical Forms of Speech*, is rather an ingenious Way of darkening, than of clearing up a Controversy. And this, though certainly a Fault, is yet what too many learned Disputants, out of Zeal to their Cause, are but too apt to be guilty of.

But to proceed. At p. 140, Mr. *Gale* readily allows, that the Verb in controversy does not necessarily imply a *total Immersion*, or *Dipping* the whole Subject: and this he illustrates in the following Manner.——" Though the whole Pen is not dipped

" all over, yet the Part particularly referred to, is. " And the Pen may be truly said to be dipped, ac- " cording to that known Rule, What is true of any " one Part, may be said of the whole complexly, " though not of every Part of the whole sepa- " rately."

And at p. 117. (as we have already observed) he acknowledges that the same Verb is equally expressive of what is under the Water, though covered by *Affusion*; as of what is *immersed*, or *dipped* into it. ——— Mr. *Gale* then having granted thus much, I would inquire, whether a Subject covered *in part*, by pouring on of Water, may not also be comprehended under the same Verb? In order to see whether this does not plainly follow from Mr. *Gale's* own Arguments, it must be observed, that he allows a Subject may be truly said βάπτεσθαι, or βαπτίζεσθαι, whether it be immersed *entirely*, or *in part* only. And moreover he affirms, that the same Verb may be applied to a Subject covered by Water, which is only *poured* upon it, p. 117. And therefore what Reason can be assigned, why a Subject, *in part* covered by *Affusion*, or *pouring on* of Water, should not also be comprehended under the same Word?

Since the Whole not being covered, makes no Difference in the former Case; how can it make any in the latter? If it be no Impropriety to apply this Verb, where the *whole* Subject is not covered over, in case of *Immersion*, where can possibly be the Impropriety to apply the same Verb, where the *whole* Subject is not covered over, in case of *Affusion*? For undoubtedly the *Whole* may as truely be said to be *covered* over, in the one Case; as the *Whole* can be said to be *dipped*, in the other.

From all which, I think it evidently follows, that, according to Mr. *Gale's* own express Reasonings and Concessions, he that covers over *part* of a Subject by *pouring* on of Water;—and also that Subject, which is thus *in part covered* over by it,—may, the one be

be ſaid, βαπτίζειν — and the other, βαπτίζεσθαι, without the leaſt Force or Violence done to the Word. — Conſequently *Baptiſm*, by pouring on of Water upon *one Part* of the Body only, muſt, ſo far as the Signification of the Word is concerned, be *true* and *proper Baptiſm*. — I do not ſay, that Mr. *Gale* affirms this; but it is ſubmitted, whether this does not fairly follow from his own Reaſonings?

Again, Mr. *Gale*, at the Beginning of his fifth Letter, p. 179, finds fault with Dr. *Wall* for keeping cloſe to Scripture for the Meaning of this Verb.

" Our Author (ſays he) appeals to the Scriptures " concerning the Word, and will be determined by " them only in this Queſtion; which is ſo unreaſon- " able a Fancy, that I admire any Gentleman of " Underſtanding ſhould be guilty of it."

And again, p. 227. ſpeaking of the Holy Scripture, " 'Tis (ſays Mr. *Gale*) the Rule we know of " our Faith and Practice, and was deſigned for that; " but not to be the Standard of Speech, which is " continually altering, and depends upon Cuſtom." It is ſurprizing, that this Gentleman ſhould here differ from Dr. *Wall*, when it was impoſſible to do it, without differing from himſelf. — *Speech* (ſays Mr. *Gale*) *is continually altering, and depends upon Cuſtom*. Conſequently, a Perſon who believed this, would be inclined to think, that it was not the ſureſt Way to have always recourſe to *Homer*, *Plato*, or *Antoninus*, for the Senſe of a Word, which was uſed in our Saviour's Time. —

But moreover, beſides this; very certain it is, that the Words and Phraſes of the Scripture, in many Inſtances, are, both as to Senſe and the Manner of Expreſſion, peculiar to itſelf. This is what we ſhall hereafter have occaſion to ſay ſomething more to; and therefore at preſent ſhall only obſerve, that, if this be the Caſe, it is not then *ſo unreaſonable a Fancy*, as Mr. *Gale* would repreſent it, to keep ſometimes cloſe to *Scripture*, for the Meaning of a

Scripture-Expression: since this may happen to be the best and surest Way to come by the true Sense of it.

Indeed that Gentleman is pleased to observe to his Friend, p. 179.— that " the most accurate *Greek* " Writers, such as the Poets, the Grammarians, *&c.* " can undoubtedly give us the true Sense of a " *Greek* Word, as well as the Scriptures them- " selves, and are as much to be depended on in " this Respect: unless it be supposed the Scriptures " have strangely altered, and wholly changed the " *Greek* Tongue, and framed a Language to them- " selves, which would unavoidably render them very " obscure and unintelligible, and so make them un- " fit for a Rule of Faith."

If by Mr. *Gale's* saying, that *the most accurate* Greek *Writers can give us the true Sense of a* Greek *Word, as well as the Scriptures themselves,*— he means, that in whatsoever Acceptation they use it, *that* ought to be esteemed one true Sense of the Word;— if this, I say, be his Meaning,— it is an undoubted Truth: but then it will be difficult to find out, to what End this is here said. And on the other hand, if that Gentleman means, that the Sense in which one *Poet* or *Grammarian* uses a Word, is constantly that Sense, in which another Writer, either sacred or prophane, uses it; then this is demonstrably a Mistake. So that, upon the Whole, those *Greek Writers*, are neither an infallible Standard for one another, nor for the *Scriptures* themselves.

And moreover, though the sacred Writers have not *wholly changed the Greek Tongue*; yet that the *Greek* both of the *Old* and *New Testament*, is different in some Instances from that of other Writers, is plain to a Demonstration.

As the Translators of the *Old Testament* into *Greek*, were *Jews*; so were also the sacred Penmen of the *New*: and that the *Hebrew* or *Syriac* Idiom is here sometimes to be met with, though in *Greek*

Words,

Words, is a plain and self-evident Matter of Fact; but of this we shall have further Occasion to speak in the following Section. However, as this can by no means render the Scriptures so *obscure and unintelligible, as to make them unfit for a Rule of Faith*; so the having Recourse to them, as the best Interpreters of themselves, in many Cases, cannot with any Propriety be called, the making them *the Standard of Speech*.—The *Holy Scripture* surely may, at least in some Respects, be a Standard of its own Language; nor is this a greater Privilege than what is often claimed by other Writers: and indeed how the various Acceptations of Words can be otherwise accounted for, I must own, I know not.

SECTION III.

THIS *Section* will consist of Observations on what Mr. *Gale* has said relating to the other principal Branch of the Controversy; and that is, concerning the proper Subjects of Baptism.

Dr. *Wall*, in order to set this Matter in a true Light, had very judiciously proposed these two Expedients. "First, to enquire what was the State of "the *Jewish* Religion, as to Baptism, at and before "that Time, when our Saviour gave his Order for "baptizing all Nations.—Secondly, to learn as "well as we can, how the first Christians did "practise in this Matter; whether they baptized "their Infants or not."

After Mr. *Gale* has mentioned these Things, p. 222, he thus remarks upon them, in that and the following Page.—"If our Author (says he) can "shew that the *Jews* did, before and at the Time "of *Christ's* sending out his Disciple, baptize the "Infants of their Proselytes; and that the primi-"tive Church immediately after the Apostles Time "did likewise use to baptize the Infants of Chri-

"stian

" ſtian Parents," Mr. *Gale* then " thinks that " Practice ſufficiently proved to have been inſtituted " by Chriſt. And though (continues that Gentle- " man) there is no Neceſſity for it, we might well " enough venture to put the Matter upon this Iſſue " with him, That when he or any one elſe ſhall be " able to prove theſe two Points, or indeed either " of them, we ſhould unite ourſelves to the eſta- " bliſhed Church, and immediately own we have " been hitherto miſtaken: which, however, is too " much to promiſe on this ſingle Condition; though " I am fully perſuaded 'tis impoſſible for any Man " to fulfil it. That our Author has not done it, I " ſhall ſhew you hereafter, and, in the mean Time, " I will make a Reflection or two, which I think " will take off the Force of all he ſays to eſtabliſh " his general Concluſion, *viz.* that *Chriſt* com- " manded to baptize Infants; even upon the Sup- " poſition, that he proves theſe two Particulars ever " ſo ſolidly."

I am at a Loſs for a Reaſon, why this Gentleman ſhould make ſuch large Promiſes, in caſe either of theſe two Points were proved; unleſs he really apprehended, that the proving of them amounted to a ſufficient Evidence, that our Saviour included Infants in his general Command.—But however, let Mr. *Gale's* Reaſons have been what they would, he was pleaſed to ſpend an hundred Pages, before he took theſe Matters into Conſideration.

His ſixth Letter principally conſiſts in a Diſſertation upon Tradition; and in repreſenting *that* to be the only Baſis for Infant Baptiſm.

The ſeventh and eighth are deſigned to prove, that Infants are ſo far from being intended in the Commiſſion, that they are neceſſarily excluded.

This, that Gentleman endeavours to make out from the Meaning of the Verb μαθητεύειν, the Noun μαθητὴς, and ſome other Obſervations.

He maintains, p. 250, 286, that this Verb never ſignifies

ſignifies *to make Diſciples*, but in the Way of actual *Teaching* and *Inſtructing*.

In order to prove this, Mr. *Gale* firſt conſiders *the Origination of the Word*, and ſays p. 263, that *no Man doubts, but* μανθάνειν *the Theme, ſignifies properly* diſcere, docere, *to learn, to teach, or inſtruct*. Again, two Pages further, he mentions the Derivation of μαθητὴς.— Μαθητὴς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔμαθον, comes from μανθάνειν, to learn or teach.—It is allowed, that the Verb μανθάνειν is uſed in both theſe Senſes, as appears from *Euſtathius* in *Homer*. p. 1561, line 41. p. 1883, line 45. Ed. *Rom*. And *Caſtalio* renders that Verb by *docerè*, 1 Tim. v. 4. But what all this will amount to, we ſhall ſee immediately. In the mean Time we obſerve, that after this, Mr. *Gale* endeavours to fix the Meaning of μαθητεύειν, from the Senſe it bears in other Writers; as alſo from ſynonymous Words; from antient and modern Verſions, and the like.

As to the Illuſtrations from ſynonymous Words, what Light can it poſſibly give us in reſpect of that Verb, as uſed by St. *Matthew*, to be told how παιδεύω is uſed by *Ælian* and *Plato*; or how ἀκέω by *Pindar* and *Plutarch*? So that really all Mr. *Gale*'s Labour of this kind can only be looked on as ſo many *learned Digreſſions*.

Indeed that Gentleman's other Method is much more rational; in enquiring how the ſame Word is uſed by other Writers: but then it would have been yet a much more effectual Way to have come at the true Meaning of that Commiſſion, to have carefully examined the Manner, in which the *Jews* were accuſtomed to expreſs themſelves upon the like Occaſion. For notwithſtanding the Writers of the *New Teſtament* have undoubtedly Words in common with other *Greek* Writers, and often uſe them in the ſame Senſe; yet is it equally certain, that the *Hebrew* or *Syriac* Idiom appears plain in ſome Parts of the *Greek* Teſtament.

It

It would be an endless Task to take notice of all those Places, where the *Hebrew* or *Syriac* Idiom may be there met with. However, by way of Confirmation, I shall here give the Opinion of some of the most able Judges relating to this Affair.

The New Testament, says *Castalio*, is so "wrote in *Greek*, that the Phrase is *Hebrew*; from "whence it happens, that many Things, which in "the original *Hebrew* would have been very easy, "are not only obscure, now they are in *Greek*, but "seem to those who are ignorant of *Hebrew*, to "have sometimes a different Meaning from what "the Author designed[y]." That *Castalio* was a very competent Judge, may be safely presumed from the Character given him by that famous Critic, Father *Simon*; who though he approves of the severe Treatment of his Version by *Genebrard*, yet affirms, "That *Geneva* never bred a Man more "profoundly skilled in *Hebrew*, *Greek*, and *Latin*, "than *Castalio*[z]." Nay, this learned Critic himself assures us, "that it is impossible for a Man to "understand the Books of the New Testament well, "who is not first much employed in the reading of "the *Septuagint*[a]." In another Place he says, "That "the *Greek* of the *Septuagint* has many *Hebraisms* "and *Syriasms*; and that the *Greek* of the New Tes-"tament is the very same.[b]"

"Both the *Greek* and *Latin* of the *Hellenists he-"braize*," says *Daniel Heinsius*: and he affirms it to be "impossible for any one to succeed in his Study "of the New Testament, who does not every "where attend to [the Language of] the *Hellenists*;

---

[y] Castal. *in Prolegom. ad Matth.*

[z] *Critical Enquiries*, Ch. xxiii.

[a] His *Critical History of the Text of the New Testament.* Part ii. Ch. 20.

[b] *Critical Enquiries*, Ch. xvi.

"or

" or who has not with Care and Judgment been con-
" versant amongst them [c]."

" The *Septuagint* Version, says the learned Pro-
" fessor *Bos*, is of great Service for rightly under-
" standing the New Testament; where are many
" Places, which cannot be explained by having Re-
" course to the pure classic *Greek*; whereas they may
" easily be explained by the Seventy Interpreters,
" and comparing them with the *Hebrew*: and for
" further Proof of this, he appeals to what our own
" famous Dr. *Pearson* had said in his Preface, to an
" Edition of the *Septuagint* [d]."

Mons. *le Clerc*, who was a good Judge in such Matters, assures us, " that the Study of *Hebrew* is
" altogether necessary for those, who would tho-
" roughly understand the New Testament [e]."

And though some learned Men may have carried their Observations to a great Extreme, and fancied there were *Hebraisms* where there are none; yet, I presume, it must be ackowledged, that the *Jewish* Customs, the Idioms of their Language, and the like, should be attended to, in order to a thorough Understanding of the New Testament.

And therefore if it was usual amongst the *Jews*, to baptize Infants, and call them *Proselytes*, or *Disciples*, as appears to have been the Case [f], then,

---

[c] *Exercit. Sac. in Rom.* viii. 22. See also *Horatii Vitringa Animad-versionum Specimen ad Vorstii Commentarium apud Observationes miscellaneas Lamberti Bos.*

[d] *Prolegom. ad Versionem Græc.* LXX *Interp.* C i.

[e] *De Arte critica*, P. i. Cap. iv.

Vide etiam Surenhusii Dissert. de Oratione Dominicâ. P. 2.

[f] See *Selden de Synedriis*, L. i. C. 3. *Lightfoot's Horæ Hebraicæ in Matth.* iii. 6.——That the *Jews* made Proselytes of any Age by Ablution, see what Dr.

according to the *Jewish* Phrase, and Manner of speaking, Children may with great Propriety be called *Disciples*, and made such by *Baptism*; notwithstanding none of the *Greeks* or *Latins*, which Mr. *Gale* has quoted, ever used the Word *Disciple* in the same Sense.——It being certainly no way material to the Point in Debate, how those Authors used and understood that Word; but only how it was used and understood by the *Jews*: since it cannot admit of any reasonable Doubt, but that our Lord's Words would be understood by them according to their own Idiom and Manner of Speech; and not according to the Phrase of the *Greeks* or *Romans*. It being utterly inconceivable, that our blessed Saviour would give a Command to his Disciples, in such a Form of Words that they could *not* understand him. And this would evidently have been the Case, if he had meant any Thing else by the Word *Disciple*, than what they had been accustomed to mean by it. And it is evident, that, amongst them, *Baptism* was indispensably necessary in order to make a *Disciple*, or *Proselyte*; according to a standing Axiom of theirs, quoted by the learned *Lightfoot* in the Place just referred to. And in another Part of the same Treatise, he quotes a Passage from the *Jewish* Writers, where an Heathen is introduced speaking thus to *Hittel*,—*Make me a Proselyte, that thou mayest teach me*[g]. From whence it appears perfectly evident, what the *Jews* meant by a *Proselyte*, or *Disciple*; and if the *Classic Writers*, amongst the *Greeks* and *Romans*, understood something else by it,

---

Dr. *Wotton* quotes from the Misna Title *Cethuboth*, with the Explication of the *Gemarists*, in his *Miscellaneous Discourses*, Vol. I. p. 105.

g *Inter Judæos Discipuli facti sunt, non qui jam docti sunt, sed ut doceantur.* Bab. Schabb. fol. 31. 1. *Dixit Ethnicus ad Hillelem, Proselytum me fac, ut me doceas.* Horæ Hebraicæ, in Matth. xxviii. 19.

as

as, I believe, no one will dispute, it is however entirely foreign to the present Purpose.

As to the Variety of Versions which that Gentleman produces, I think it is sufficient to observe, that if by a critical attending to the *Jewish* Phrase and Customs, it does really appear that even none of the Versions do fully express the Sense of the *Evangelist*, in that Place; I say, if this be the Case, and whether it be or not must be submitted, then it is not the Number of Versions agreeing in the same Thing, that can make the least Alteration in the Matter; or cause *that* to be *true*, which is demonstrably a *Mistake*.

At p. 239, Mr. *Gale*, speaking of the baptizing of Infants, has this Observation, —"That if our "Saviour meant, that the Apostles should have done "it, 'tis a Wonder he did not say so." Again, p. "248. "The Words [in the Commission] do necessarily oblige to teach, All, whom they intend should "be baptized." And at p. 254. "There's no Ground "to say some only [must be taught before Baptism] "because the Commission makes no Distinction, "between what is to be done to some, and not to "others."

In answer to which, I desire it may be considered, that if our Lord's Disciples were sufficiently acquainted with the Nature of the *Jewish* Baptism, —*What Persons* were accounted the proper Subjects of that, and who were not; it was impossible that they should be at any Loss, how they were to understand their Master's Commission; howsoever it was delivered in general Terms.—Nor will there be the least Absurdity in supposing, that *some* were to be taught *before* Baptism; and that *others*, because of their Incapacity, were to be admitted *without* teaching; notwithstanding our blessed Lord did not express that Distinction.——For if the *Jews* did admit both the *Adult* and their *Children* by *Baptism*;

of which we have very sufficient Evidence[h]; no solid Reason can be offered, why our Saviour should expressly name Children in his Commission, when he knew his Disciples, from the very Usage and Custom of their own Nation, would of course understand, that his Command must certainly include *them*.

We shall now proceed to that Gentleman's ninth Letter, where he begins to examine into what Dr. *Wall* alledges to have been the Practice of the *Jews*, in relation to Baptism, before our Saviour's Time. And the Doctor having cited the Rabbins as Witnesses on his Side, Mr. *Gale* endeavours throughout this whole Letter to invalidate their Evidence, by representing them in a Manner disadvantageous enough.

But now allowing that those Men are as *bad Interpreters*, as *despicable*, *ignorant*, and as *whimsical*, as that Gentleman would represent them; can it however enter into the Head of any one to conceive, either that they are not acquainted with their own Customs, or that they grew so enamoured with the *Christians*, as to borrow a Custom from them about the Middle of the second Century[i], which they

---

[h] *Parvulos etiam baptizarunt, plerumque cum Parentibus.* Bab. Cherubb. fol. 11. 1.——*Et Gemara paulo post. Si cum Proselyto Proselyti facti etiam sint, filii sui filiæque, iis cedit in bonum quod à Patre eorum factum est.* Lightfoot's *Horæ Heb. in Matth.* iii. 6.

[i] The *Jews* are not agreed as to the Date of their *Mischna*. Some will have it compiled 120 Years after the Destruction of the second Temple: others in the Time of *Antoninus Pius*. Dr. *Wotton* says, there is nothing in the Book itself which contradicts the highest Age. See his *Miscell. Discourses*, V. I. p. 80.——The learned Dean *Prideaux* fixes it in the Middle of the second Century. See his *Connexion*, P. 1. L. v. p. 257.

were

were Strangers to before? As neither of these can in reason be supposed; so if the *Mischna*, as explained by the Commentaries upon it, does affirm what Dr. *Wall* cited it for, one would think that the Custom of the *Jews* in baptizing of Proselytes, was clear beyond Exception. For though Mr. *Gale* objects, p. 328, that *there is no Necessity to understand the Mischna in Dr. Wall's Sense*, yet as to the *Commentaries* on it, he owns, that they *perhaps may be allowed in some Measure to favour him*. P. 328. And if to this we add, that the great *Maimonides*[k] himself is entirely on our Side of the Question; I think, we need remark nothing further on this Head: especially considering that, according to Mr. *Gale's* own Confession, *no Man understood the Sense of the Talmud better than Maimonides*. P. 390.

But still to sink the Credit of the *Rabbins*, Mr. *Gale* calls in to his assistance several learned Moderns, who, it must be confessed, speak very severely of them. P. 349. 351. However, let their Censure be never so just (as there may perhaps be no great Reason to think it otherwise) yet what follows from hence? Does it appear that they knew *not* what Ceremonies were in Use amongst themselves? Or that after the Destruction of their Temple, they grew *fond* of those of the *Christians*? Nothing that is here quoted from these learned Adversaries of the *Jews*; or from our blessed Lord and his Apostles (who are also cited p. 352) will bear any such Inference or Construction. Nay, so far are Mr. *Gale's* Arguments in this Place from proving what they are brought for, that Dr. *Lightfoot* in particular, who is mentioned by him, p. 351. as speaking very contemptibly of some of the *Rabbins*, does himself positively affirm, that *the Baptism of Men, Women, and Children, appears by incontestable Evidence from*

[k] See Dr. *Lightfoot's* Harmony, ii. 72.

the Jewish Writers [l]. And how far Dr. *Lightfoot* was a Judge in this Case, we appeal to Mr. *Gale* himself, who calls him *our great English Rabbin; than whom none ever better understood, nor were more universally acquainted with the Rabbins and their Writings*. P. 350. 368.—Consequently then, in the Judgment of this great Critic in *Jewish* Learning, though the *Rabbins* deserve Censure, they are yet proper Evidence that the *Jews* baptized their Proselytes.

We are next to observe, that Mr. *Gale* quotes two *Rabbins*, who ridicule the *Baptism* of *Christians*; and that from thence he would infer, that they were Strangers to an *initiatory Baptism* of *Proselytes* themselves. P. 330 *ad* 333.

But can it be any Wonder that such warm Adversaries of *Christianity* should abuse an *Ordinance*, which set aside that *Circumcision*, of which they were so exceedingly tenacious? And which, many of the *Jews*, even after they had embraced the Religion of *Jesus Christ*, still thought themselves obliged to retain [m]? Undoubtedly a great Regard for this Rite, and an inveterate Malice against the *divine Author* of our *Faith*, might well excite two or three *Rabbins* [*Men of no Credit*, says Mr. *Gale*, *and never to be depended on*, p. 139] to reason after an extravagant Manner about *Christian Baptism*.—For if it be *the greatest Folly and Madness in the World, to believe, on their sole Authority, what the Rabbins should universally assert in so many Words* (which Mr. *Gale* affirms to be his Opinion, p. 334) and this, in a Matter where they have *no Interest* at stake:—Is it not a little astonishing, that their Arguments should be allowed of *any Weight*, where their *Passions* are evidently *inflamed*; and where they have plainly a *Cause* to *serve*?—I think it may with great Truth

[l] *Harm.* on St. *John*, i. 25.
[m] *Acts* xv. 1. 5. 24. *Gal.* v. 1, 2. 12, 13.

and

and Modesty be observed, that a Person who has Recourse to such a Method for defending himself, seems conscious that his Cause is a *little* indefensible.

But still it does by no means appear, that these Men knew of no *initiatory Baptism* amongst the *Jews*. For their Indignation might well prompt them to ridicule a *Rite*, which both abolished what they so greatly valued, and to which they themselves were obliged to submit, as well as the *Heathen World*.—This must have been such a Mortification to them, as might well prompt some of these Writers, to traduce this new Method of *initiating Jews* as well as *Gentiles*, without intending to deny, that they *baptized* Proselytes themselves. But to put it past all reasonable Doubt, that we have mentioned the real Cause, why the *Christian Baptism* is treated with so much Anger by some of these Writers; let us only hear the Complaint of one of the *Rabbins*, as quoted by Mr. *Gale* himself, p. 332.—— *They have abrogated Circumcision, and substituted Baptism in its stead!*——*Hinc illæ Lachrymæ!*—Here really seems to be the very Foundation of all the Outcry in the present Case.—As if this *angry Rabbin* had said, "Here is an *Institution*, that does not "only set aside *Circumcision*, but puts both *Jew* and "*Gentile* upon the same Foot! Not the least Differ-"ence being made between us and the rest of Man-"kind!"

A Person who duly attends to this, can be at no Loss to assign a Reason for so much Anger and Indignation. Nor is there indeed the least Foundation for Mr. *Gale's* Remark, p. 331. "That if *Baptism* "had been a Custom amongst themselves, the *Rab-*"*bins* would not have failed to have put us in mind, "how much we were beholden to *them* for the *sub-*"*stantial Ceremonies* of our Religion,"—since these *substantial Ceremonies* differed in too many Particulars to make them appear the same. And indeed

they agreed in little else, besides the mere *material* Action only. For though they had a *Baptism*, it was for *Gentiles*, not for *Jews* (however, not for the *Adult* [n]) whereas the Christian took in both *Jew* and *Gentile*. Moreover, theirs no way set aside *Circumcision*, but this was designed to abolish it. Nor, lastly, was theirs administered in the same Names. And therefore, this Difference being but too plain not to be discerned,—they might naturally enough express their Indignation at the *Christian Baptism*; without the least Thought of putting us in Mind, what Obligations we lay under to them. Besides Mr. *Gale* declares, p 334, that the Rabbins *are despicable and ignorant Writers*; and consequently it is not to be wondered at, if they sometimes forget to make those proper Remarks, which may naturally offer themselves to more judicious Men. As to what Mr. *Gale* observes, that *this Baptism* amongst the *Jews*, is no where in Scripture, p. 365. and that it is *only founded on the Judgments and Determinations of their Rabbins*, p, 390. it is abundantly sufficient to answer, That the Question is not,—*By what Authority, they did this?* but, Whether *they had such a Custom, or not?*—That Gentleman indeed tells his Friend, p. 391, that "even supposing "the Fact could be demonstrated, it is no Rule to "us in the Administration of a Christian Sacra-"ment, as being only a Tradition of their Elders, "and not grounded on Scripture, nor derived from "*Moses*. And this, says Mr. *Gale*, cuts off one "great Part of the pretended Evidence for *Infant* "*Baptism*."

That Gentleman had too good an Understanding to have made use of *such* Arguments; if *better*

---

[n] *Some learned Men have indeed thought, that the* Jews *baptized their own Children: as* Hammond *and* Lightfoot.

could

could have been found. And it is enough to raise a Suspicion, that that Cause is not very defensible, which so able a Person manages in so weak a Manner. For the Point under Consideration was altogether this,— *How Baptism stood amongst the* Jews; *both before and in our Saviour's Time?*—If it could be proved, that they initiated all their *Proselytes* by *Baptism*, it would then appear plain from that very Custom, how our *Saviour's Commission* was to be understood.—For they being accustomed to receive *Infants*, as well as the *Adult*, by *Baptism*; and our Lord having given no express Directions for making any Alteration in that Matter; it was fairly to be presumed, that *Infants* were included in his general Command. It being certain, as was before observed, that, without such an excepting Clause, his Disciples would understand, from the known Usage and Practice of their Nation, that their Great Master did not mean to *exclude* them.—But then surely none ever imagined, that it was *this Custom*, on which the *Authority* of the *Apostles* for baptizing was founded. *Their Authority* was undoubtedly the Command of *Christ*: though the Custom of that Time may be a good Light to *us*, as we suppose it was to *them*, how to understand the Nature and Meaning of that Command.—This certainly can no way derogate from the *Divine Authority* of that Command; nor can that Custom be said with any Propriety, to be, in any other Sense, *a Rule to us, in the Administration of a Christian Sacrament*. And as to Mr. *Gale's* Conclusion, that *one great Part of the pretended Evidence for Infant-Baptism is cut off*; because Baptism amongst the *Jews was only a Tradition of their Elders, and not grounded on Scripture, nor derived from* Moses, this Conclusion has nothing to support it. The Question to be enquired into, was a bare Matter of Fact only; and if that appear evident, it is of no Moment to us in the least, let the *Jews* ground their Custom on what Mistake they will.

SECTION

SECTION IV.

HAVING in the third Section, considered what Mr. *Gale* had to object to the Custom and Practice of the *Jews* in *baptizing* of *Proselytes*; I proceed in this to take Notice of that Gentleman's Inquiry, how *Infant-Baptism* stood with relation to the Practice of the *Primitive Church*.

Mr. *Gale* begins, in the eleventh Letter, to examine into this Matter; but he really appears very unsettled and wavering. In one Place, p. 398, that Gentleman tells us, that "it is hardly to be imagined that any considerable Body of those antient Christians should so soon deviate from the Customs and Injunctions of their venerable Founders."

A few Lines further he allows it to be "very probable, that the Primitive Churches kept to the Apostles Pattern." P 399.—And soon after, he verily believes that the primitive Church maintained, in this Case, an exact Conformity to the Practice of the Apostles." And yet, a Page or two before this, we are informed, that "the Testimonies of the Fathers cannot support Infant-Baptism, though they should afford ever so many and full Citations: for if the Fathers, says Mr. *Gale*, only prove *Fact* in the Church, and not *Right*; and the Church was not wholly pure from Innovations; how does this prove the Baptism of Infants was no Innovation, but an Institution of *Christ?*" P. 397. See also p. 322.

It must certainly be acknowledged, that the bare Practice of the Church after the Apostles could by no means impress a *Divine Authority* on any Custom whatever. But then this was not the Matter in Issue. The Point to be tried was, whether Infant-Baptism could be proved to have been the *Practice* of

of the Primitive Church? And if this could fairly be made out,—considering Mr. *Gale* did *verily believe that the Primitive Church maintained, in this Case, an exact Conformity to the Practice of the Apostles*; then that Gentleman must be apprehensive, that we had at least *presumptive* Evidence, that the Thing in Dispute was no *Innovation*, but an *Institution of Christ*. I think this plainly follows from that learned Writer's own Principles.

Again, at p. 399. "I allow it (says he) to be very "probable, that the Primitive Church kept to the "Apostles Pattern. But then I desire it may also "be considered, that this, though ever so probable, "cannot be fairly made equivalent to the Authority "of the Scriptures: so that if it can be proved "from the Scriptures to be but likewise so much as "probable, that the Apostles did not baptize Infants "(which I think I have already shewn) that other "Probability drawn from the Writings of the Fa-"thers ought not to be urged against us."

Most certainly, if the Authority of *Scripture* be on the one side, every Authority besides will be but a poor Counter-balance on the other. But then it is to be considered, that the Practice of the Primitive Church in this Case is not brought as an Authority *in Opposition* to the *Scripture*; but only to give some Light, for the better understanding what might be the Sense of our *Saviour's* Commission to his *Apostles*. And Mr. *Gale* himself evidently allowed it to be so proper to this Purpose; that he declares, p. 222, that if it could be shewn, that "the "*Jews* did baptize the Infants of their Proselytes, "before and at the Time of *Christ's* sending out "his Disciples; and that the Primitive Church, im-"mediately after the Apostles Time, did likewise "use to baptize the Infants of Christian Parents, "that then he thought that Practice sufficiently "proved to have been instituted by *Christ*."—Now, how far it appears to have been the Practice and

and Custom of the *Jews* at that Time, I presume, has been clearly made out already: and how far it appears to have been the Practice of the Primitive Christians, is to be the Subject of our present Inquiry.—At p. 461. Mr. *Gale* very severely animadverts upon my learned Predecessor, the Reverend Dr. *Wall*, on account of a Passage from *Justin Martyr's* Apology, which the Doctor thus translates, — "Several Persons among us of sixty and seventy "Years old, of both Sexes, who were discipled to "*Christ in their Childhood*, do continue uncor-"rupted."— "Every Body (says Mr. *Gale*) knows "well enough, that ἐκ παιδῶν signifies not *in*, but "*from* their Childhood." To convince therefore the most prejudiced, I shall shew the Disingenuity of our Author's Version more largely than so obvious a Matter requires.

Here Mr. *Gale* attempts to prove the Doctor's *Disingenuity* by several Quotations, out of different Writers; which, however, are only so many plain Illustrations of his own Mistake.—To discern this very manifestly, we shall take Notice of some of those Quotations. At p. 462, he quotes *Tully* thus speaking of *Diodotus* the Stoick,—*Under whom* (says *Tully*) *I studied* (à puero) *from a Child*.—In answear to this, I beg Leave to ask, Whether *Tully* meant that he did not study under *Diodotus*, *during the Time* he was accounted a *Child*; or only, that he then began, when he *ceased to be such?*

Again, *Laertius* says of *Xenocrates* the Dull, of *Chalcedon*, that *he studied under* Plato [ἐκ νέου] *from his Infancy* — Surely Mr. *Gale* could not understand by this, that he did not begin to study whilst he was called νέος; but only that he then entered upon his Studies under *Plato*, when that Appellation no longer belonged to him. One would think it impossible for a Person of Mr. *Gale's* Abilities thus to understand this Passage; and yet, unless he did, it is nothing to the Purpose. But Mr. *Gale* goes on.—

By

By some divine Direction (says *Socrates*) *a certain Dæmon has continued to attend me, beginning from my Infancy* [ἐκ παιδὸς.] Now is it possible for any one to think, that the Philosopher meant by this,—that the *Dæmon* did not attend him during *any Part* of his *Infancy*, but that he only then began his Attendance, when the Infancy of *Socrates* was *over?* And yet, unless this be the Sense of it, it is hard to say of what Service it can prove to Mr. *Gale*.—However he goes on: *Plutarch* says of *Cato* Minor, that *he was observed* [ἐκ παιδίου] *even from his Childhood, in his Voice and Countenance, and in his Play, to be of an inflexible, morose, and obstinate Disposition.*—By which, according to Mr. *Gale*, we are not to imagine that *Cato* discovered the Morosenes of his Temper, during *any Part* of his *Childhood:* Since this would be rendering, with Dr. *Wall*, ἐκ παιδίου, *in* his Childhood, not *from it*;—but on the contrary, as near as can be conjectured from Mr. *Gale's* Reasoning, we are to suppose that *Cato* only then gave Proof of his untoward Disposition, when his *Childhood* was actually *past*.

Nothing can well be more out of the Way than this.—For let the Period of Infancy end where it will:—suppose for Instance, at ten Years of Age, as Mr. *Gale* fixes it, p. 501.—can any one apprehend, that *Socrates* meant that his *Dæmon* did not attend him till this *tenth* Year was *over?* Or that *Plutarch* designed to say, that *Cato* made no discovery of his Morosenes *till* the same Time?

Mr. *Gale* mentions several other Places; as where the Psalmist says,—*Thou art my Trust* [ἐκ νεότητός μου] *from my Youth.* Surely the Royal Prophet did not mean to say,—*Thou art my Trust, after my Youth was past.*—Again, where the young Man in the Gospel returns this Answer to our Blessed Saviour,—*Master, all these have I observed* [ἐκ νεότητός μου] *from my Youth*; can it be supposed, that he designed only

to

to acquaint our holy Lord,—That he obſerved theſe Things *after* he ceaſed to be a *Youth?*—

Can a Perſon ſeriouſly affirm this to be the Meaning? And if this be not the Meaning, to what Purpoſe ſerve all theſe Quotations?—For if *from my Youth, from my Infancy*, or *Childhood*, mean at leaſt, during *ſome Part* of it; as it certainly muſt; then all theſe ſeveral Inſtances are only ſo many plain Proofs, that they who were *diſcipled* to *Chriſt* ἐκ παιδὸς *from* their Childhood, were moſt certainly diſcipled *in* it.—We muſt further remark, that Mr. *Gale*, after he has finiſhed his Quotations, plainly intimates to his Friend, in ſo many Words, that if Matters are as Dr. *Wall* maintains them to be, that then the Doctor's *Argument is a very formidable one.*—But then Mr. *Gale* adds, "I beg you, Sir, "to obſerve the whole Force of it depends upon "our Author's Miſrepreſentation of the Words; "which is beyond Excuſe." P. 461.

But now if, on the contrary, it is evident that Dr. *Wall* has not *miſrepreſented* thoſe Words; then his Reaſoning from them remains in full Force;—Mr. *Gale's* ſevere Animadverſions are without Foundation; and we have withal that Gentleman himſelf confeſſing, that the Doctor has laid down *a formidable Argument* for *Infant-Baptiſm.*—And indeed this very ſingle Paſſage cited from *Juſtin Martyr*, who flouriſhed the Middle of the ſecond Century, is ſo plain and full a Proof of this Practice, that it is of itſelf ſufficient to ſhew, what was the Cuſtom of the *Primitive Church*, in relation to the *Baptizing* of *Infants*. So that really the Matter in Controverſy might very well reſt here; and be ſubmitted to the Judgment of any impartial Perſon. But however, there are two or three other Things, that I muſt take the Liberty of mentioning.

At p. 541, Mr. *Gale* obſerves, that "as the earlieſt "Times are much the more conſiderable and pure, "what cannot be proved to have been taught or "practiſed

" practised in them, we shall not (says he) be very
" forward to admit of now, barely upon the Au-
" thority of the more corrupt Centuries, when an
" infinite Number of Innovations and Errors were
" introduced."

Indeed it must be owned, that though it be merely a Matter of Fact we are inquiring after; yet as it is a Fact relating to the first and purest Times of Christianity; so Proofs ought not to be admitted for it, which are *barely supported upon the Authority of the more corrupt Centuries*. And truly if this was the Case; if we were destitute of all Proofs, but such as had no better Support, the Argument for Infant-Baptism drawn from the Practice of the first Christians, would certainly be very weak and ill-founded.—But as this demonstrably is not the Case; so, I think, nothing but the Warmth of Controversy, and that natural Eagerness, which is almost universal, of getting the better of an Argument, could have induced a Person of Mr. *Gale's* good Sense, so much as to have insinuated such a Thing. For besides the Passage just cited from *Justin Martyr*, that Custom appears so evident about the Middle of the following Century, that Mr. *Gale* himself acknowledges, *It was very common in St.* Cyprian's *Time*. P. 528.

But perhaps it may be thought by some, that Mr. *Gale* looked upon the Age of St. *Cyprian* to be part of those *corrupt Centuries* just mentioned; and consequently that his Evidence, in the present Case, can be of little Weight,

To determine this, it will be necessary to observe, what Mr. *Gale's* Opinion was of the first three Centuries.—At p 411. he says, that *if Dr.* Wall *had cited the Writers of the first three Centuries, it had been considerable*. Consequently then, St. *Cyprian* being one of these Fathers (he flourishing about the Middle of the third Century) his Evidence, according to Mr. *Gale's* express Confession, ought to be

esteemed of some Force. And his * lix^th Epistle is cited by Dr. *Wall*, as it had been by others, which contains the Determination of an *African* Synod, held *Anno* 254. And from thence the Custom of *baptizing Infants* appears so evident, that Mr. *Gale*, as we just observed, owns *it was then very common*.

This synodical Epistle then, containing the Sentiments of *Cyprian*, as well as of his Brethren, is a direct and manifest Proof of *Infant-Baptism*. And let it be remembered, it is also taken from those *Centuries*, whose *Authority* Mr. *Gale* owns to be *considerable*.

However, notwithstanding all this, it is very certain, that Mr. *Gale* very plainly intimates, that *Infant-Baptism* did not prevail till after the first three Centuries were over. For at p. 411. that Gentleman thus expresses himself,—"The Authorities Mr. *Wall* makes use of in Reference to this Text (*John* iii. 5.) are, I think, all too late, *and of those Centuries* wherein Pædobaptism, and many other Abuses are known to have prevailed. If he had cited the Writers of the first three Centuries, it had been considerable."—Again, at p. 514. where Mr. *Gale* having mentioned the Fathers of the first Three hundred Years, he adds,—"As for the following Centuries, in which Infant-Baptism, together with a Multitude of Intolerable Errors, prevailed in the Church, it is not to be wondered at, if several Passages of Scripture were strangely misapplied to defend them."—From hence it is as manifest, as it can possibly be, that Mr. *Gale* here opposes the *first three Centuries* to the Age, in which *Infant-Baptism prevailed*;—though at p. 528, he makes it to have commonly prevailed about fifty Years before the first three Centuries were

* Dr. *Cave* calls it the lx^th. See his *Prim. Christianity*, p. 193.

over.

over. Infant-Baptism, says that Gentleman, being *very common in St.* Cyprian's *Time.*

I beg Leave here to remark, that, to suggest this Custom is supported *barely upon the Authority of the more corrupt Centuries,* p. 541.—to intimate that it *prevailed* only after the first three Centuries were over, (p. 411, 514.) and yet to own it to be *very common about* the Middle of the Third (p. 528.) and withal to express a great Esteem for the Writers of the first Three hundred (Years p. 411, 514.) —All this plainly discovers, what Inadvertencies a Man of great Abilities may be guilty of, when he is resolved to make more of a Cause than it is really capable of. If any one should imagine, that though Mr. *Gale* expresses a Veneration for the Writers of those Centuries, he might yet except St. *Cyprian*; because he affirms, p. 529, that *the Africans were generally Men of weak Understandings*; I can only answer, none who have any Esteem for the Memory of Mr. *Gale*, can suppose he would rank that Father [P] amongst *weak* and *contemptible* Men.

The next Thing I would observe, is Mr. *Gale's* Objection to the Account which Dr. *Wall* had given of the famous Controversy between St. *Austin* and *Pelagius.*

" He endeavours (says Mr. *Gale*) to strengthen " his Supposition from the Dispute between St. *Au-* " *stin* and *Pelagius.* But this will do him no Ser- " vice, if you consider their Dispute was not, whe-

---

P *Instar Fontis purissimi lenis incessit et placidus.*— Jerom. in Epistol. ad Paulinum.

Erat ingenio facili, copioso, suavi, et aperto. Ut discernere nequeas, utrumne ornatior in eloquendo, an facilior in explicando, an potentior in persuadendo fuerit. Lactant. L. v. Instit.

Non alium video inter eos, qui Latinè scripserunt, qui ad Apostolici Pectoris vigorem propius accedut. Erasm. L. ii. Epist. xviii.

" ther Infants ſhould be baptized or no, but for " what End they were baptized." P. 45. Surprizing indeed! As if it would have added more Strength to Dr. *Wall's* Suppoſition, in caſe *Infant Baptiſm* had been at that Time a *diſputable* Queſtion!

Mr. *Gale* proceeds,—" He ſhould not have ſaid, " They do declare that they never read or heard of " any Chriſtians, that were againſt Infant Baptiſm; " but, which had been truer, that *Pelagius* did not " contradict St. *Auſtin*, when he declared he never " heard of any that denied Baptiſm was given for " Remiſſion of Sins." *Ibid.*

Let us now examine, which of thoſe two learned Men is miſtaken. Whoever will give themſelves the Trouble of dipping into that Father's Works, Tom. VII. p. 795. Cap. xvii. of the *Baſil* Edition, will find, that in a Letter deſigned for *Innocent* Biſhop of *Rome*, but who being dead it came to the Hands of *Zoſimus*, *Pelagius* complains, that he was ſlandered of denying *Baptiſm* to *Infants*,—*dicit ſe ab hominibus infamari* (ſays St. *Auſtin*) *quòd neget Parvulis Baptiſmi Sacramentum.*—— This I mention, firſt, to give ſome Light to a Paragraph in the next Chapter of this Father's Works; and in which is contained what Mr. *Gale* objects to. *Cum enim dixiſſet* (ſays St. *Auſtin* of *Pelagius*) *nunquam ſe vel impium aliquem Hæreticum audiſſe, qui hoc quod propoſuit de Parvulis diceret; deinde ſubjecit atque ait, Quis enim ita Evangelicæ Lectionis ignarus eſt, qui hoc non modo affirmare conetur, ſed qui vel leviter dicere, aut etiam ſentire, poſſit? Deinde quis tam impius qui parvulos exortes Regni Cœlorum eſſe velit, dum eos baptizari et in Chriſto renaſci vetat* [q]? Tom. VII. p. 796. Cap. xviii.

---

[q] Instead of *vetat*, the *Baſil Edition* reads *putat*,—which making downright Nonſenſe of what went before, I have altered that Word according to the reading of Dr. *Wall's* Edition; which is abſolutely neceſſary to make Senſe of the Place.

Though

Though this Sentence, *Qui hoc quod proposuit de Parvulis diceret*, considered barely by itself, be something dark; yet if we observe what follows this Sentence, and also attend to the Complaint of *Pelagius*, just before cited,—That *he was slandered of denying Baptism to Infants*;——it is, I think, impossible not to understand it with Dr. *Wall*, as relating to *Infant Baptism*. This is what he was taxed with denying; this is the very Thing he complains of as a *Calumny*; and what he is clearing himself from the Charge of.——And therefore since this is the very subject Matter of his Defence, when he says *he never heard any impious Heretick affirm of Infants*——*hoc quod proposuit*——What can it possibly relate to, but the Charge brought against him for denying them *Baptism*; and which he had publickly complained of, in a Letter to the *Bishop* of *Rome*? In a word, when we consider that immediately after this Sentence, he thus expostulates, "For who is "so ignorant of the Gospel, that he can attempt not "only to affirm this, but can get leave of himself so "much as lightly to mention, or even to think it? "Lastly, who so impious as to exclude Infants from "the Kingdom of Heaven, by forbidding them to "be *baptized*, and *born again* in Christ?"——I say, all this being considered, the Sense of that Place seems clear and determined, beyond, one would think, the very Possibility of Doubt or Exception.

And now, if so able and diligent a Man as *Pelagius*, who lived 1300 Years nearer the *Apostolick* Age than we do; who was pressed with the Argument taken from *Infant Baptism*; and whom therefore it highly behoved, to examine carefully, whether this was not a novel Doctrine, unknown to the *Apostles* and first Christians: but who was so far from being able to make such a Discovery, that he owns he *never heard of any one who was against it*:—I say, if this be Case, it seems the very Height of

Improbability, that *Infant Baptism* should have been such an Innovation as Mr. *Gale* would represent it, and yet the inquisitive *Pelagius* not be able to discover it.

I know there lies an Objection against what we have here remarked; and that is, *Tertullian*[r] had long before declared himself against *Infant Baptism*. And therefore if his Writings escaped the Search of *Pelagius*, how do we know but the Writings of many others might have escaped him too?

That *Pelagius* had never seen this Piece of *Tertullian*, is very natural to suppose; and though it is no wonder, that a single Tract should escape him, yet it is by no means probable, that if many others had defended the same Side of the Question, that all their several Writings should also have been unknown to a Person of his Abilities and Sagacity. It is much more likely, that *Tertullian* was herein singular. For the learned *Dupin*, who was well versed in Writings of this Sort, expressly declares, that "one finds no other Writer in all Antiquity who "speaks after this Manner[s]."

Again, we must observe, that Mr. *Gale's* Friend had objected, p. 542,—"That it must seem mighty "strange, and indeed improbable to such as reflect up-"on the great Piety and Sincerity of the early Centu-"ries of the Church, that an Innovation of this Na-"ture should ever be in the least attempted, and much "more that it should prevail so far, and be so gene-

---

[r] *De Baptismo.*

[s] That learned Man having remarked, that the Error of *Tertullian*, relating to the Baptism of Heretics, was common to him, with many others; he adds, that his second Error, which regards the Baptism of Infants, *Lui est particuliere, et on ne trouvera pas, que aucun des Anciens ait parlé de la même maniere.* Biblioth. Nov. Vol. I. de Tertulliano.

"rally

" rally owned and defended, and all so early as even " we ourselves (says Mr. *Gale)* acknowledge it " was ."——But in answer to this, Mr. *Gale* desires his Friend to consider, that " That very Piety and " Zeal he mentions as a Security against this Inno- " vation, in reality tended very much to betray " them into it." P. 543.

That *a Zeal without Knowledge*, and a *Piety* falsly so called, have been productive of *many Innovations*, and *much Wickedness*, is a Truth too notorious to be dissembled; but to affirm that these, or either of them, were the Occasion of bringing in *Infant Baptism*, must, I presume, appear, after what we have already remarked, a downright begging of the Question,, against manifest Proof and Evidence.——But let Mr. *Gale*, by *Zeal* and *Piety* mean what he may, I presume, *Infant Baptism* plainly appears to have been no manner of *Innovation* at all.

Upon the whole, notwithstanding Mr. *Gale* could get leave of himself to affirm, as was observed at the Beginning, " That we have no Right to *Church-* " *Membership*, nor ought to be *communicated with*; " and that we have *no Baptism* amongst us;" [p. 81. 84.] yet I am thoroughly persuaded, that whoever shall thoroughly weigh and examine Matters, with that Freedom and Ingenuity as become a sincere Lover of Truth, will certainly find that that Gentleman has here greatly overshot himself; and that he has oftener than once suffered his Zeal to get the better of that good Understanding and Learning he was Master of ——And I will venture to affirm, that *Infant Baptism* must be excellently well founded, which still remains firm and unshaken, though so vigorously attacked by so able an Adversary. He has undoubtedly discovered great Reading, and excellent Abilities; but he has withal, I think, sometimes discovered too great a Desire and Eagerness of Victory. And indeed this seems to be the Cause

why

why he does not always reason with that Closeness and Consistency, as might well be expected from a Gentleman of his Parts and Learning.——And indeed, where an Overkeenness of getting the better in a Controversy, is joined with a great Capacity, it tends frequently to confound the World, by spiriting up Disputes, and rendering of them endless.

I am,

My reverend and very dear Brother,

Yours affectionately,

Vin. Perronet.

THE APPENDIX.

AS it will be easily allowed, that the late Mr. *Gale* was one of the most learned Antagonists of *Infant Baptism*; so it may well be supposed, that his Arguments are not always suited to *every* Capacity; and consequently, that an Answer to those Arguments cannot be adapted to the Understanding of *every* Reader. For which Reason, it was judged necessary to add something further, which might be more level to the Apprehension of those, who have not had the Advantage of a liberal Education; that so the Piece might be of as general Use as I could make it.

But first, I would earnestly intreat every one, whether *learned* or *unlearned*, to seek after that *Mind which was also in Christ Jesus*. That *meek*, and *lowly*, and *charitable Spirit*, which breathes through the whole divine Gospel of *Christ*. A *Spirit*, which is entirely opposite to a rash, blind, and intemperate *Zeal*; a *Zeal*, which proudly censures and condemns every one, who does not conform to *our Way* and *Manner* in some outward Things. Not considering that *the Kingdom of God is not Meat and Drink, but Righteousness, and Peace, and Joy in the Holy Ghost*. Rom. xiv. 17. And therefore let me beseech you, in the most affectionate Manner, not to suffer your *Zeal* for any particular Method of *Baptism*, so to swallow up, or to run away with your Minds, as to cause you to neglect seeking after that *inward Kingdom* of *God*, without which neither *your Baptism* nor *ours* will avail any thing. If the great

great Enemy of Souls can but make us to overlook the *Power of Godlineſs*, he will readily contribute his Aſſiſtance, to make us very *eager* and *zealous* about the *mere Form* of it. Let us then endeavour, ſince we *know his Devices*, that he may *not gain an Advantage over us*. My Intentions are not to ſpeak againſt baptizing of thoſe who are grown up, nor to find fault with *Dipping*: but to ſhew that the *Baptiſm* of our own Church is agreeable to the *Goſpel* of *Chriſt*; and conſequently, that the condemning of it muſt proceed from a *Zeal without Knowledge*.

But now, if you, my Brethren, could be ſatisfied, that the *Jews*, in our bleſſed Saviour's Time, baptized the Children of thoſe Heathens, who embraced the *Jewiſh* Religion; I ſay, if you could be ſatisfied of this, I ſhould hope it might clear up to you the full Meaning of our Lord's Command to his Diſciples.

For if it was the univerſal Cuſtom of that People to baptize *all* ſuch *Proſelytes*, together with their *Children*, the Diſciples of our Lord muſt of courſe underſtand, that they themſelves were in *like manner* to baptize *Infants*, as well as *grown Perſons*, in making of them *Proſelytes* to the Religion of *Chriſt*. The Words, we allow, are general; they do not *expreſly* mention either *old* or *young*; but if it was the Cuſtom of the *Jews* to *baptize* both the *one* and the *other*, muſt not the Diſciples of *Chriſt* underſtand our Lord's Command to relate to *both*; unleſs he had *particularly* excepted one of them? Therefore, if our bleſſed Saviour had *not* deſigned that *Infants* ſhould have been *baptized*, he would moſt unqueſtionably have told his Diſciples *not* to *baptize* them. Becauſe, without ſuch an *expreſs Exception*, they muſt neceſſarily ſuppoſe that both *young* and *old* were equally to be *baptized*; as they knew that *both* had always been baptized by their own Nation. And for the Proof of this, I muſt appeal to the

Teſti-

Testimony of the learned Dr. *Lightfoot*[a], who was so well versed in the *Jewish* Writings, that Mr. *Gale* himself calls him, *our great English Rabbi*[b]. So that if *Children* were *included* in the general Command of *Christ*, all those Objections must vanish of course, which are often made to *Infant Baptism*.——We readily allow, that Infants are not capable either of *Faith* or *Repentance*; but surely, if *Christ* would have them *baptized*, they must be *capable* of *Baptism*. And therefore those other Qualifications can only be required of grown Persons, who are come to Years of Understanding[c].

You know, undoubtedly, that with regard to *Circumcision*, what God chiefly signified or required by that Ordinance, was the *true Circumcision* of the *Heart*[d]. But how were *Infants* capable of *this*? However, you find, that God saw proper they should be *circumcised* notwithstanding. And if *Christ* likewise has seen proper, that *Infants* should be *baptized*, then all Arguments against it must fall to the Ground. And it is very observable, that *Baptism* is expresly called by the Name of *Circumcision*; *Circumcision made without Hands*: and the *Circumcision* of *Christ*[e]. All which seems plainly to denote, that God designed it should succeed into

---

[a] *Horæ Hebraicæ in Matth.* iii. 6. *Harmon.* ii. 72. *in John* i. 25.

[b] P. 350. 368.

[c] This is evidently all that our Church means in the *Catechism*, to wit, that *Repentance* and *Faith* are requisite to *Baptism* in *all such* as are *capable* of them; but that in the Case of *Infants*, it is promised in their Name, that they *shall* both *repent* and *believe*: and that this *Promise they are bound to perform, when they come of Age*.

[d] *Deut.* x. 16. *Jer.* iv. 4. *Acts* vii. 51. *Rom.* ii. 28, 29.

[e] *Col.* ii. 11, 12.

the

the Place of that *ancient Ordinance*. And therefore, if Children were capable of the *one*; what ſufficient Reaſon can be aſſigned, why they ſhould not be capable of the *other*?

That the firſt Chriſtians thought they were *capable* of *Baptiſm*, muſt be plain from this one ſingle Teſtimony of *Juſtin Martyr*, an excellent Defender of Chriſtianity, who lived ſo early as about 150 Years after our Lord's Time; and who ſpeaks expreſly of "ſeveral Perſons amongſt them, of ſixty "or ſeventy Years old, of both Sexes, who were "*diſcipled* to *Chriſt from their Childhood*[f]." He uſes the very Word of our holy Lord; when he commanded his Apoſtles to go and *diſciple*, or, as we have tranſlated it, to *teach*, all Nations[g]. So that according to the Opinion of thoſe primitive Chriſtians, *Infants* or *Children* were thought capable of being thus made *Diſciples* to *Chriſt*.

Theſe Things being duely attended to, muſt give great Light to the Meaning of our Lord's Command; and may plainly diſcover, that he deſigned both *Infants*, as well as *grown* Perſons, to be made his *Diſciples* by *Baptiſm*.

But again, you have been uſed to ſuppoſe, that the Word, which ſignifies to *baptize*, muſt *always mean dipping*, and nothing elſe. But this, I do aſſure you, is a very great Miſtake.

For though the late learned Mr. *Gale* affirms this more than once; yet he found himſelf afterwards obliged to own, that it did *not always neceſſarily imply* it[h]. And this is what I ſhall now make out, from the *New Teſtament* itſelf.

---

[f] Juſt. Mart. Apol. ii. p. 62.

[g] *St* Matth. xxviii. 19. μαθητεύειν. *The ſame Word is likewiſe uſed St*. Matth. xxvii. 57. *where it is tranſlated* — himſelf was Jeſus Diſciple.

[h] *See his Letters*, p. 117; *or, the Second Section of the foregoing Letter*.

We

We are told by the Evangelist, St. *Mark* [Ch. vii. 4.] that *when the* Jews *come from the Market, except they wash, they eat not.*—If the Original was literally translated, it might run thus:—*Except they are baptized.* But, that here cannot be meant a *dipping* of themselves in Water, must appear from hence, that the *Jewish Masters* never required such a *plunging* of the Body in order to their taking of Food; but only the *washing of their Hands*; as is maintained by two of the greatest Masters of *Jewish* Learning, that ever wrote upon this Subject[i]. And it is plain, that the Evangelist is not there speaking of any *extraordinary* Pollution, which might require an *entire Immersion* of the Body; but only of their constant Custom of washing, before they would eat.

But this will still appear more evident from St. *Luke*; who acquaints us, that *a certain Pharisee marvelled, that* [our Lord] *had not first washed before Dinner*[k]. It is the same Word, as before, and might literally be translated,—the *Pharisee marvelled*, that he had not been first *baptized* before Dinner. What this *Pharisee* here wonders at, in our Lord, is the very Thing which others had found fault with, in his Disciples; and that is, that they did eat with *unwashen Hands*[l]. And further, I would observe, that it appears to have been the antient Custom of *washing their Hands*, to have the Water *poured upon* the Hands by some Servant[m].

So that, according to the *Scripture-Use* of the Word, such a Person may be said to be *baptized*, who has Water *poured* upon only *some* part of the Body. And this, I think, should have some Weight

---

[i] *The Learned* Lightfoot *in his* Horæ Hebraicæ, *on the Place. And the learned* Pocock *in his* Miscellaneous Notes *on the* Porta Mosis *of* Maimonides.

[k] St. *Luke* xi. 38.

[l] St. *Mark* vii. 2, 3, 5.

[m] 2 *Kings* iii. 11.

with those, who have a proper Regard for *Scripture-Authority*.

But again. What we render the *washing of Tables* [St. *Mark* vii. 4.] is in the Original, — the *Baptisms of Beds* or *Couches*. But surely we cannot imagine, that they washed their *Beds* or *Couches* by *dipping* of them into the Water; but only by pouring Water *upon* them [n].

From what has been said, it seems plainly to follow, that *Baptism*, and *baptize*, do not, according to the *Scripture-Use*, *necessarily* imply *dipping* in their Signification. And therefore, though it be granted, that the usual Method of *baptizing* was by *dipping*; yet as that was a mere Circumstance, and not *necessarily* inferred in the Word itself, it cannot be looked upon as *essential* to *Baptism*.

And further, it is worthy of Notice (which has also been observed by others) that where the Holy Spirit directly and evidently designs to express the Action of *dipping*, there he makes use of a different Word [o]. As where our Lord speaks of *Judas dipping with him in the Dish* [p]; where he speaks of the *Sop*, when *dipt*, to be given to *Judas* [q]; where the rich Man desires that *Lazarus* may *dip* his Finger in Water [r]; and where mention is made of a Vesture dipt in Blood [s].

In all these several Places, a Word is used, which in its *immediate proper* Meaning strictly signifies to *dip*.

But still another Reason, which may discover that actual *dipping* cannot be thought *essential* to *Baptism*, is this, — that the *Holy Spirit* sometimes expresses the *Sacrament* of *Baptism* by a Word, which is used for any kind of *washing* whatever. As where mention

---

[n] *See the learned Dr.* Lightfoot's Horæ Heb. *in the Place.*

[o] Βάπτω or ἐμβάπτω. [p] St. *Matth.* xxvi. 23. St. *Mark* xiv. 20. [q] St. *John* xiii. 26. [r] St. *Luke* xvi. 24. [s] *Rev.* xix. 13.

is

is made of *Christ's cleansing his Church, with the washing of Water, by the Word* [t]. Where we are said to be *saved by the washing of Regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost* [v]. And where the Apostle speaks of the *Heart sprinkled from an evil Conscience*, and *our Bodies washed with pure Water* [w]. All these Places have a Reference to *Baptism*; but the Word made use of, has nothing to do with the Action of *dipping*. So that notwithstanding the antient Manner of *baptizing* was generally by *dipping* the whole Body into the Water; yet, since it can be esteemed no more than a mere Circumstance, and consequently not *essential* to *Baptism*; therefore, whether a Person be *baptized* by *dipping*, or by *pouring on* of Water, such a Person ought to be esteemed *truly* baptized. Our Church approves of both Methods, as may be seen in her Offices relating to the Baptism of *Infants*, as well as the *Adult*.

And now, my Brethren, whether I can convince you, or not,—that Children have a Right to this Ordinance; to be thus brought to *Christ*, and dedicated to him by Baptism; yet, let me convince you of this one Thing, that, if you keep not the Laws of *Christ*, we may say of your *Baptism*, as the Apostle says of *Circumcision*, it is made *No-baptism*. And you would do well to consider, whether all rash censure, and judging, and condemning of those, who differ from you in *outward Things*, be not breaking that *Divine Law* of *Christian Charity*, without which we are all *nothing* in the Sight of God?

But further, before I conclude, I would endeavour to set some Persons right, with respect to an excellent Part of religious Duty; though it relate not to the present Subject. That the *Singing* of *Psalms* or *Hymns* is universally opposed by Persons

---

[t] *Ephes* v. 26. τῷ λουτρῷ.
[v] *Tit.* iii. 5. διὰ λουτροῦ. [w] *Heb.* iv. 22. λελουμένοι.

 of

of the *Baptist Persuasion*, I believe not; but since many do greatly oppose it, I must beg Leave just to shew them their Mistake. And if it should appear, that this is commanded in the *New Testament*; and that it was practised by the Christians of the first and purest Ages, then, one would think, it might be esteemed as a standing Duty belonging to Christians of *all Times* and *Places*. But first, there is very little Reason to doubt, whether our Lord himself and his Disciples *sung an Hymn*, after his last Supper[x]. It being highly probable, that they sung the very Hymn which the *Jews* were accustomed to sing at the *Paschal Supper*: and every one knows how greatly Singing was in use amongst that People. This, I say, is highly probable, though the Word there used does not necessarily imply *singing*. For the very Circumstances of the Action may direct us to the Meaning of the Word. But let us next consider, what St. *Paul* says to the *Corinthians*. *I will sing with the Spirit; and I will sing with the Understanding also*[y]. The Apostle here declares, that besides *exercising his spiritual Gift in singing*, he would also *sing* in such a Manner, as that he might *profit* or *benefit* others. And the original Word here used, strictly signifies to *sing to any Instrument of Music*[z]. And further, it is to be observed, that the Apostle is here giving Directions, how they should behave in the *Church* of God, or in their *public Assemblies*: and that is both to *pray* and *sing*, as he himself would do in those Places.—And consequently, if he would there *pray* and *sing with the Spirit*, and *with the Understanding also*, it was likewise *their* Duty to do the same.—And this will sufficiently explain his Directions to the *Colos-*

---

[x] St. *Matth.* xxvi. 30. [y] 1 *Cor.* xiv. 15. ψαλῶ.

[z] *See* Drusius *in loc.* Zanchius *on* Ephes. v. 19. *See also the learned* Grotius *on* 1 Cor. xiv. 15. *and on St.* James v. 13.

sians,

ſians; to wit, that they ſhould be *teaching* and *admoniſhing one another in Pſalms, and Hymns, and ſpiritual Songs* [and] *ſinging with Grace in their Hearts to the Lord*[a]. Here they are plainly commanded to *inſtruct* and *build up* one another by this holy Exerciſe; and at the ſame Time, to take care, that their *Hearts* did accompany their *Lips*.

And as this Paſſage in the *Coloſſians* is exactly parallel to that in the *Epheſians*, it will therefore give great Light to our preſent Tranſlation, which runs thus:—*ſpeaking to yourſelves* [it ſhould have been rendered — *to one another*] *in Pſalms, and Hymns, and ſpiritual Songs; ſinging, and making Melody in your Heart to the Lord*[b].

So that we may ſee here, the perfect Agreement between St. *Paul's* Directions, and what may be called his *Example* and *Practice*. Since whatever he declares he *would do*; we may well look upon as his own *real Example* propoſed to us.

But again, let us hear the Holy Ghoſt by the Mouth of St. *James*.—*Is any among you afflicted? Let him pray. Is any merry? Let him ſing Pſalms*[c].

And here I muſt obſerve, that the Apoſtle uſes the ſame Word, in this Place, which, I juſt before took Notice, does in its ſtricteſt Meaning ſignify *ſinging* to an Inſtrument of *Muſic*. Not that I ſuppoſe the Apoſtle uſes the Word in that *ſtricteſt Senſe*; any more than, I ſuppoſe, the other Apoſtle did; but it

---

[a] Coloſſ. iii. 16.

[b] Epeſ. v. 19. *It is amazing, why our Tranſlators ſhould render the very ſame Word, in a parallel Text, ſo very differently. The Word* ἑαυτοῖς, *which is here tranſlated* yourſelves, *is in* Coloſſ. iii. 13. and 16. *tranſlated* one another. *And ſo it is* Epheſ. iv. 32. *See* Grotius *there*; *and on Ch.* v. 19. *See him alſo, and* Gomarus, *on* Coloſſ. iii. 16. *And to the ſame Senſe is that Word tranſlated St.* Mark x, 26. *and* 1 Theſſ. v. 13.

[c] *Ch.* v. 13.

must certainly signify *singing*, in the *proper* and *usual* Meaning of the Word.—Here then is surely sufficient Authority for public and private *Singing*. And he therefore who thinks *singing* of *Psalms*, or *Hymns*, or *spiritual Songs*, too *light* and *airy* an Exercise, should seriously reflect, *who it is that has commanded it*. And withal, should ask himself this Question, —How can that be too mean an Exercise for *poor miserable Man*, upon Earth, which employs the very Angels of God in Heaven?—— See *Revel.* Ch. v. ℣. 8. to the End. See also Ch. xiv. ℣. 1, 2, 3.

But now, if any well-meaning Person should object, that though *singing*, both in *public* and *private*, seem plainly to have been enjoined and practised in the Age of the Apostles: yet possibly it might be confined to that Age only. I say, if any entertain such Doubts, I should hope their Doubts might be easily removed, when they are informed, that the same Practice was continued in the first and purest Ages after the Apostles: and of this we have the Testimony both of Friends and Enemies to Christianity.

That famous Heathen, *Pliny* the younger, who lived in the Year 100 after *Christ*, tells the Emperor *Trajan*, that the *Christians met together before Day, to join in singing Hymns to Christ, as God* [d].

Tertullian, a famous Christian Father, who lived within 200 Years after *Christ*, speaking of their public Worship, says, that the *Scriptures are read*, and *Psalms are sung* [e]. And elsewhere, that after the Celebration of the Lord's Supper, *every one sung to*

---

[d] L. x. Epist. xcvii. *Carmen Christo, quasi Deo, dicere.*

[e] *Scripturæ leguntur, Psalmi canuntur.* De Animâ, Cap. 3.

God, either out of the Holy Scriptures, or else something of their own composing [f].

Origen, a most holy and pious Christian, who lived about 230 Years after our blessed Lord, observes, that without the *Holy Spirit* they *could not sing, or utter Hymns to God, either in Time, or Measure, or Harmony* [g]. All which is a plain and sufficient Proof, that the *Christians* in his Days did *thus* endeavour to *sing* Praises to God.——So that there is no question to be made, but that even from the earliest Times of *Christianity*, so far as they were suffered by their frequent Persecutions, the *Christians* thus employed themselves. St. *Jerom* gives this remarkable Relation of them in his Time, which was 400 Years after *Christ*, "That there "was no going into the Field, but the *Plowman* "might be heard at his *Hallelujahs*, the *Mower* "might be heard at his *Hymns*, and the *Vine-dresser* "*singing* the *Psalms* of *David* [h]."

In short, this divine Exercise seems to have been a Part of their constant Employment, either in [i] *public* or *private*, from Morning to Night.

As it also witnessed to by another learned and famous Christian Writer, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, who lived so early as about the Year of our Lord 204 [k].

So that upon the whole, it is greatly to be hoped, that this Part of Devotion, so plainly enjoined by the *Holy Spirit*, and so remarkably practised by the first and best Christians, may recommend itself to

---

[f] *Quisque de Scripturis sanctis, vel de proprio ingenio provocatur in medium Deo canere.* Apolog. C. 39.

[g] *De Orat.* Sect. 6.

[h] *Epist. ad Marcel.* Tom. I. p. 127.

[i] Cave's *Primitive Christianity.* P. 169. 177.

[k] *Stromat.* L. vi. p. 475. 483. L. vii. p. 523. *Pædag.* L. ii. c. 4. p. 121.

all

all those, who sincerely desire to obey the *whole Gospel* of *Christ*, and to imitate the *first* and *purest* Followers of their *Lord*.

May the Spirit of Christ lead you and me into all Truth.

I am your sincere Friend,

and Servant in Christ,

V. P.

BRITISH
24 AP 74
MUSEUM

Publiſhed by the ſame Author.

A *Vindication* of Mr. *Locke*, from the Charge of giving Encouragement to *Scepticiſm* and *Infidelity*, and from ſeveral other Miſtakes and Objections of the learned Author of the *Procedure, Extent, and Limits of human Underſtanding*. In ſix Dialogues. Wherein is likewiſe enquired, whether Mr. *Locke's* true Opinion of the Soul's *Immateriality* was not miſtaken by the late learned Mr. *Leibnitz*.

Humani nihil à me alienum puto. Ter.

II. A ſecond *Vindication* of Mr. *Locke*, wherein his Sentiments, relating to *perſonal Identity*, are cleared up from ſome Miſtakes of the Reverend Dr. *Butler* (now Lord Biſhop of *Briſtol*) in his Diſſertation on that Subject; and the various Objections raiſed againſt Mr. *Locke*, by the learned Author of *An Enquiry into the Nature of the human Soul*, are conſidered: to which are added, *Reflections* on ſome Paſſages of Dr. *Watts's* Philoſophical Eſſays.

Cenſure is the Tax a Man pays to the Publick for being eminent. Lord *Bacon*.

III. Some *Enquiries*, chiefly relating to *Spiritual Beings*: in which the Opinions of Mr *Hobbes*, with regard to *Senſation*, *immaterial Subſtance*, and the *Attributes* of the Deity, are taken notice of. And wherein likewiſe is examined how far the Suppoſition of an *inviſible Tempter*, is defenſible on the Principles of natural Reaſon. In four Dialogues.

Τὸν Θεὸν ὅλα τε σοφώταλον, βυλομενόν τ' ἐπιμελεῖσθαι καὶ δυνάμενον. Plat. de Leg. L. x.

Ψυχὴ ἂν εἴη, πρὸς τῷ ἀθάναλος εἶναι, καὶ ἀνώλεθρος.

Idem in *Phædone*.

Δαίμων κακὸς τρέπων πρὸς ἀδικίαν.

Zaleuc. *apud* Stobæum.

IV.

IV. Some Thoughts on the divine *Hospitality* of the *Gospel*; and on *Hospitality* falsly so called; in a Discourse on *Rom.* xii. 13.

V. An *Essay* on *Recreations*.

Neque enim ita generati à Naturâ sumus, ut ad ludum et jocum facti esse videamur: sed ad severitatem potius, et ad quædam Studia graviora, atque majora. Cic. *de Officiis*, L. i. C. 29.

VI. An earnest Exhortation to the strict Practice of *Christianity*; drawn up chiefly for the Use of the Inhabitants of the Parish of *Shoreham* in *Kent*.

Strait is the Gate, and narrow is the Way which leadeth unto Life, and few there be that find it. St. Matth. vii. 14.

If any Man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his Cross daily, and follow me. St. Luke ix. 23.

VII. Some *Reflections*, by way of Dialogue, on the Nature of *Original Sin*, *Baptismal Regeneration*, *Repentance*, the *New Birth*, *Faith*, *Justification*, *Christian Perfection*, or *Universal Holiness*, and the *Inspiration* of the *Spirit* of *God*.

Ἡμεῖς δὲ κηρύσσομεν Χριστὸν ἐσταυρωμένον, Ἰουδαίοις μὲν σκάνδαλον, Ἕλλησι δὲ μωρίαν. 1 Cor. i. 23.

——σὺ τί λέγεις, ὦ Ἕλλην; σοφίαν ζητεῖς; Ἔχεις τὸν Χριστὸν, σοφίαν ὅλα τοῦ Παλτρός. Οἱ μὲν γὰρ φιλόσοφοι περὶ ψυχρὰ καὶ ἀνόητα ἠσχολήθησαν, ὁ δὲ σταυρὸς τὸν κόσμον ἔσωσε. Theophyl. *in* 1 *Cor.* i. 24, 25.

Νέκρωσον τοίνυν τὸ σῶμα, ἵνα οἰκῇ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐν σοι, καὶ δι' αὐτὸ δοθῇ σοι ἡ ζωή. Idem in *Rom.* viii. 11.

Humbly inscribed to the most Reverend and Right Reverend the Lords the Archbishops, and Bishops of *England*.

VIII. An affectionate Address to the People called QUAKERS: with regard to *Water-Baptism*, and the *Lord's Supper*. Wherein the Arguments of the late learned Mr. *Robert Barclay* are considered.

Ye

Ye are my Friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you. St. John xv. 14.

IX. Some Remarks on a late anonymous Piece, intitled, *the Enthusinsm of Methodists and Papists compared.* In a Letter to the Author.

——μηδὲ ὀνομαζέσθω ἐν ὑμῖν, καθὼς πρέπει ἁγίοις ασχιρότης, καὶ μωρολογία, ἢ εὐτραπελία, τὰ οὐκ ἀνήκοντα.

Ephes. v. 3, 4.

If any Man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his Cross daily, and follow me. St. Luke ix. 23.

BRITISH
24 AP 74
MUSEUM